Aggiornamento?

Schelkens, K.; Dick, J.A.; Mettepenningen, Jürgen

DOI:
10.1163/9789004254114

Publication date:
2014

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Aggiornamento?

Brill's Series in Church History

Edited by

Wim Janse
VU University Amsterdam

In cooperation with

Jan Wim Buisman, Leiden
Theo Clemens, Utrecht/Antwerpen
Paul van Geest, Amsterdam/Tilburg
Alastair Hamilton, London
R. Ward Holder, Manchester, NH
Scott Mandelbrote, Cambridge, UK
Andrew Pettegree, St. Andrews

VOLUME 63

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/bsch

Aggiornamento?

Catholicism from Gregory XVI to Benedict XVI

By

Karim Schelkens, John A. Dick,
and Jürgen Mettepenningen

With an Afterword by

David G. Schultenover

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2013

Cover illustration: (c) Wikimedia Commons, (c) Archives Centre for the Study of Vatican II, KU Leuven, (c) Archives Saulchoir, Paris.

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1572–4107
ISBN 978-90-04-25410-7 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-25411-4 (e-book)

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With the present volume the authors hope to offer something unique, a history that connects the history of the Roman Catholic institutional Church with theological reflection: Church history and historical theology. Such an undertaking means writing about people, their actions, and their thoughts often in a summary fashion. Doing so requires an informed respect for people back then as well as today, and writing about them with a degree of humble trepidation that we were taught so well by one of our former professors and fellow church historians, Boudewijn Dehandschutter († 2011). In the very first place, we dedicate this book to him.

The myth of the lone scholar was punctured long ago. Writers are indebted to teachers, colleagues, intellectual sparring partners, and other authors of books and articles. We thank first of all those who have given our manuscript a careful and critical reading: Dr. Leo Declerck (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, and doctor honoris causa of Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität Mainz), Prof. Dr. Philippe Chenaux (Lateran University), Dr. Michael Quisinsky (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg), Prof. Dr. Paul Van Geest (Tilburg University), Prof. Dr. David G. Schultenover (Marquette University). We thank them all for their supportive interest in our project and for their constructive criticism and helpful suggestions. Many special thanks to Dries Bosschaert, for his assistance in fine-tuning our manuscript and in creating a name index that will greatly assist the reader who needs to quickly check about a key personality living and working in the time frame of our book.

We are greatly honored that, after reading our text, David G. Schultenover offered to write a fascinating and personal afterword in response to the title of our book. With sincere gratitude, we appreciate as well the endorsement that Philippe Chenaux was happy and willing to write. Also, we wish to express our profound gratitude to the staff of Brill, and in particular to the series's editor-in-chief Wim Janse (Free University, Amsterdam) for the confidence and support he was willing to give to this project. Finally, we thank our wives and children, who gently remind us that they deserved more time than this book allowed them. We hope, nevertheless, that in no small way they share in our pride about what you, the reader, now have in your hands.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAS	*Acta apostolicae sedis*
AD	*Acta et documenta concilio oecumenico Vaticano II apparando*
ANL	*Annua nuntia lovaniensia*
APhC	*Annales de philosophie chrétienne*
ARCIC	Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission
AS	*Acta synodalia sacrosancti concilii oecumenici Vaticani II*
ASS	*Acta sanctae sedis*
BETL	*Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovansiensium*
BLE	*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*
BRHE	*Bibliothèque de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*
BSCH	*Brill's Series in Church History*
Card.	Cardinal
CDF	Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith
CELAM	Latin American Episcopal Conference
COPECIAL	Permanent Committee of International Congresses for the Lay Apostolate
CrSt	*Cristianesimo nella Storia*
CRTL	*Cahiers de la Revue théologique de Louvain*
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*
HCPR	*Handbook of Contemporary Philosophy of Religion*
IT	*Instrumenta theologica*
ITC	International Theological Commission
It.	Italian
Lat.	Latin
LTPM	*Louvain Theological Pastoral Monographs*
NS	New Series
Oss. Rom.	*L'Osservatore Romano*
QSNT	*Quellen und Studien zur neueren Theologiegeschichte*
RHE	*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*
RPL	*Revue philosophique de Louvain*
RSPT	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*
RTL	*Revue théologique de Louvain*
SPCU	Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity
TC	Theological Commission
Trans.	Translation

TRSR	*Testi e ricerche di scienze religiose*
TS	*Theological Studies*
TTS	*Tübinger theologische Studien*
Vol.	Volume
WCC	World Council of Churches

INTRODUCTION

Questioning Aggiornamento

Aggiornamento. That one word was the title of a book that greatly inspired us. The author was the Dutch theologian Ted Mark Schoof; and his book surveyed Catholic theology from 1800 to 1970, with the cumbersome growth, struggle, and flowering of the "new theology." The book first appeared in 1968, and its title was straightforward and affirmative.[1] In the immediate aftermath of the Second Vatican Council, the euphoric judgment of most people within the Roman Catholic Church was obvious: the church could and would renew itself in conversation with the times, modern discourse, and the needs of people. Today we stand nearly five decades later: after fifty years of discussion, interpretation, and reception of that same council, the self-assured and much anticipated *aggiornamento* of Schoof's book is now viewed very differently, in various parts of the world. Most recently the interpretation of the Second Vatican Council itself has been brought to center stage examination. The emerging picture is anything but uniform.

Anyone inclined to explore a Catholic blog or two—for fun or for more professional purposes—will immediately understand what we mean. Alternatively, simply Google the term *aggiornamento* and it won't be long before our point becomes very clear. While there can be no doubt whatsoever that the Second Vatican Council still fires imaginations, it also continues to rock more than the occasional boat. Opinions are strongly divided, as book titles such as that of Alexandra von Teuffenbach, *Eine etwas andere Geschichte des Zweiten Vatikanums* ("A somewhat different history of Vatican II") delicately testify.[2] They are divided in terms of

---

[1] Ted Mark Schoof, *Aggiornamento: De doorbraak van een nieuwe katholieke theologie* [Theologische Monographieën] (Baarn, 1968). Published in English three times: Mark Schoof, *Breakthrough: Beginnings of the New Catholic Theology* (Dublin, 1970), *A Survey of Catholic Theology, 1800–1970* (Paramus, 1970), and *A Survey of Catholic Theology, 1800–1970* (Eugene, 2008).

[2] Alexandra von Teuffenbach, *Aus Liebe und Treue zur Kirche: Eine etwas andere Geschichte des Zweiten Vatikanums* (Berlin, 2004). On the other side of the spectrum see interesting volumes such as those by Ormond Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II: Some Hermeneutical Principles* (New York, 2004), and the recent book by Massimo Faggioli, *Vatican II: The Battle for Meaning* (New York, 2012).

academic background and expertise, the environment from which they spring, and their language and style. What is important, at the present juncture, is the simple empirical observation that on the internet and in a variety of publications many people today have radically rejected Vatican II. For these people, Vatican I was the last truly authentic doctrinal council in the church's tradition.

Sadly enough, concepts such as "Modernism" and "heresy" are no strangers to this contemporary polemic. Other observers insist that Vatican II should be seen as a necessary "revolution," and embrace it as the most innovative event in the church's last four hundred years. From the historian's perspective, both are problematic, and between these extremes lies a broad grey zone with more than a few shades of opinion and a multitude of positions. Introducing contemporary theology students to Vatican II, and the issues surrounding it, is no simple and straightforward matter. Actually, today's students and today's teachers are in much the same boat. The present volume, therefore, aims to provide them with the necessary background perspective and information that will help them make balanced and sound judgments.

These remarks bring us to the primary goal for this book. While it would be interesting to review the full range of current interpretations of Vatican II, our focus lies elsewhere. It is not our wish to take a stand in the prevailing controversies, nor do we seek to provide a comprehensive systematic theological reflection on church renewal. In our historical and theological survey, our aim is to explore the methodology underpinning contemporary thinking about the notion of "reception" in Catholicism; and thereby do justice to the way in which it has been crystallized in recent academic theology, and refined by eminent scholars such as Gilles Routhier. Most particularly, our interest, as church historians, focuses on a key point. In ecclesiastical and theological speaking, the term "reception"—a fortiori where councils are concerned—is often reduced to "reception of." A great many studies address, for example, the reception *of* Vatican I, or the later reception *of* Vatican II.

When we look more closely at the functioning of reception, however, we see a dynamic that is richer and far more complex than the mere questions regarding the postconciliar implementation of a council. Linked as it is to the dynamic of tradition, reception always involves an interaction between givers and receivers. Simply stated, councils are not just "received" by the church community, to a greater or lesser extent, they themselves are also agents of reception: they receive a past, take up a

tradition, and then pass it on, in their own particular way. This observation, worked out in our book, is the golden thread that links the major roles played by both Vatican I and Vatican II. With this reflection, we make it quite clear that a council's embedding in church language has an earlier history and a broad horizon. Herein lies the specific contribution of this book: a broad perspective presentation of major developments that deeply marked Post Enlightenment Catholicism and played a central role in shaping both councils and their aftermath.

To provide an appropriate introduction to our theme, we begin with Pope Gregory XVI. His pontificate laid the foundation for the church's reaction to the challenges of the Enlightenment. Early on, we see these challenges played out along two axes, which continually intersect. They are discussed and explored as central elements in this book. One axis covers the tension between faith and reason, a classic problem for theology. This tension became a major challenge in the aftermath of the Enlightenment. Again and again, from Vatican I's dogmatic constitution *Dei filius* and the crisis of Modernism right up to Pope John Paul II's encyclical *Fides et ratio*, tensions and debate about this issue are the heritage of the Enlightenment.

And then we have the other axis: the relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and the (religious or non-religious) other. This axis often crosses the path of the theological tension between faith and reason in modernity, but generates its own specific problems, certainly after the fall of the *Ancien régime*. Unavoidably, any contact with otherness leads to a reflection about one's own identity; and it is particularly noteworthy, in the two centuries explored in this book, that Roman Catholic self-determination is constantly in the spotlight. Along with this issue of the other comes the factor of plurality. A multitude of "others" tend to defy contemporary Catholicism. When confronting the modern states, the Catholic Church has lived the continual challenge of redefining its relationship to the civil order, from the nineteenth-century *Syllabus errorum* to the twentieth century *Dignitatis humanae*. All the while, the other was and is encountered in a plurality of political ideologies, in liberalism, in Marxism and Fascism, as in religious groupings. Again and again, over two centuries, the Catholic Church has had to discuss and delineate its own frontiers, and to reexamine its position on other Christian churches and communities, as well as on other religions. In light of these two intersecting axes, we intend to merge two perspectives, as well: the history of the Roman Catholic Church as institution on the one hand, and the evolution

of thinking and theological discourse within the church. In seven chapters, we explore the interplay of each, across two centuries. They are often in tension with each other but hard to separate because their history is so intensely intertwined. Within these perspectives, this book then tells the story of the two most recent councils in history: it portrays their background, their proceedings, and their aftermath, and the story of two axes intersecting the life of the church over two centuries. We hope to demonstrate what a complex field church renewal—*aggiornamento*—really is.

Today, we possess a number of excellent church historical studies. Many are listed in our bibliography. Rarely however does one find a satisfactory work that integrates both institutional church history and historical theology. In our experience, students and others interested in the contemporary history of Catholicism can benefit from just such an integrated perspective. We hope that our book will help to achieve this kind of integration.

Filling-in church historical gaps in understanding does not imply, of course, that this book has no limitations nor incompleteness. Covering a broad area in just one book has the advantage of making much information readily available; but it has a downside as well: the limitations of not being exhaustive, not being able to explore all the names and events that have impacted and shaped Catholicism across these two centuries. Nor can one monograph cover developments and personalities in all the regions of our world. We have to admit, at this juncture, that our study is in the first place a Western European study of major events and major players within two centuries of Catholic life and thought. That such a study has contemporary value is indeed our conviction; and we have conscientiously and consistently endeavored to base our research on recent and internationally respected historical and theological literature.

We invite the reader to walk with us through the fascinating forest of church history and theology. We trust that our book will make that exploration both pleasant and highly informative, as we point out and examine the big trees, less attention is devoted to the fascinating undergrowth along the way. For those who wish to further explore this on their own, we provide ample footnotes and specifically chosen contemporary bibliographic references. The bibliographical selection offered in the back of the book may also guide readers toward further study.

One closing thought: As church historians we find it delicate and daring to write about very recent and current history. Nevertheless, with all modesty and in view of the terrain we covered in earlier chapters, we do find it appropriate and opportune, to briefly explore, at the end of the seventh

chapter, the pontificate of Pope Benedict XVI, which has recently come to an unexpected close. Our observations are of course a glimpse and necessarily limited. At the very end of our book, we invite David Schultenover to respond to the question mark in the title of our book: *aggiornamento?* We value his reflections as an open invitation to continue our reflections about and within the church.

CHAPTER ONE

MOVING TOWARD VATICAN I: ULTRAMONTANISM VERSUS LIBERALISM

1. *Gregory XVI and the Difficult Heritage of the Enlightenment*

1.1. *The Triumph of the Holy See*

In very poor health, from his election on March 31, 1829 until his death on November 30, 1830, Pope Pius VIII was succeeded, in February 1831, by the general superior of the Camaldolese Order, Bartolomeo Alberto Cappellari. He chose the name of Gregory XVI. At the time of his election, Cardinal Cappellari was not yet a bishop. He is the last man, so far, to be elected pope prior to his episcopal consecration. This very fact sets the tone for two centuries of striking evolutions within the Roman Catholic Church.

The new pope already had well developed papal ideas long before he was elected to his high office. Gregory XVI's view of the papacy was monarchical and elitist, as had been prefigured somewhat in his 1799 book *Il trionfo della Santa Sede*.[1] In it, Cappellari had defended the church as a monarchy, independent of civil powers, and presented the Roman Pontiff as a supreme monarch, applying the term "infallible" long before the promulgation of the dogma of papal infallibility. After his election, his book attracted new attention. Moreover it was being read within a new context: the period from the late eighteenth century until 1830 had been one of numerous revolutions. In the aftermath of the American Revolution of 1776, and the French Revolution of 1789, the Catholic Church faced the Napoleontic era; and then on the eve of the election of Gregory XVI, the crises of the summer of 1830 which forced the church to reposition itself continually.

Among the most pressing challenges for the new pope was the rise of the Italian *Risorgimento* movement, which strove for a unification of Italy under one republican state. The movement was mainly sustained by

[1] Published in a new edition shortly after his papal election. *Trionfo della Santa Sede e della Chiesa: Contro gli assalti dei novatori combattuti e respinti colle stesse loro armi* (Venice, 1832).

liberal powers from several fractions, and in 1832 these forces were bundled together in the *Giovane Italia* movement, led by Giuseppe Mazzini. Mazzini would spend the next four decades pursuing revolutionary actions to promote Italian unification; and he would end up being the main spokesperson for the *Risorgimento* movement.[2]

Risorgimento fiercely aimed its arrows at anyone or anything hindering the foundation of the Italian State, such as the Austrian occupation in northern Italy and the vast papal territories in the centre of the country. On numerous occasions, rebel troops attempted to occupy parts of the Papal States, and Gregory XVI reacted by summoning the Austrian troops to combat the liberal rebels, many of whom ended up in the papal prisons.

Naturally, the situation was more complex, and stretched beyond Italian borders. Perhaps somewhat ironically, the pope, at the same time, had approved of the new Belgian Constitution. Drafted after the 1830 Belgian Revolution and the foundation of the new State of Belgium, it supported the separation of church and state. This is even more striking, when one takes into account the fact that Pope Gregory had decided to condemn the Polish Catholic uprisings against the Tsarist regime. Russian Tsar Nicholas I had, since 1825, undermined the positions of Roman Catholics and Greek Catholics in the Russian ruled Polish territories, forcing many to convert to Russian Orthodoxy, thereby blocking communication between the Catholic territory bishops and the pope. The pope's reaction can be understood, in the light of his attitude toward *Risorgimento*. If he disapproved of rebellion in Italy, he consequently would do so in other regions.

International political and ideological developments such as these provide part of the background against which the encyclical *Mirari vos*[3] can be understood. It rejected any limitation of ecclesiastical power as well as the growing power of secular society. The 1832 encyclical also bears the marks of the church's difficulties dealing with the aftermath of the American and French Revolutions of the eighteenth century. *Mirari vos* chose the path of refutation. Along with it came a condemnatory linguistic style that rejected religious indifference, freedom of conscience, and

---

[2] See for general political background, *Italy in the Nineteenth Century, 1796–1900*, ed. John A. Davis [The Short Oxford History of Italy] (Oxford, 2000).

[3] Gregory XVI, 'Mirari vos (August 15, 1832),' *Acta Gregorii Papae XVI*, ed. A.M. Bernasconi (Rome, 1971), 1:171–2. See as well: Gregory XVI, *Mirari Vos: On Liberalism and Religious Indifferentism* (Kansas City, 1998).

the idea that civil powers could ever limit church powers. Furthermore, it stressed the unbreakable bond of marriage as well as the importance of priestly celibacy. This encyclical throws us right into the centre of early nineteenth-century Catholicism, and outlines themes of discussion that last up until the present day. Indeed, *Mirari vos* figures among the most important church documents of that century, and we will return to it later on in this book. The importance of the encyclical was not just because it set the agenda for decades to come, but also because it featured a style and language which was rather new, and would be adopted by Gregory's successors. In general, one notices an opposition toward anything that is seen as "new" and not in accordance with the claims of the Catholic magisterium. As a result, the church and its leaders were strongly criticized throughout Europe, by political, social, and religious opponents. This situation would continue throughout the long nineteenth century, and would play a major role in setting the stage for the election of Pope Pius IX, whose pontificate constitutes a major field of interest and point of departure for this book.

In 1846, after the death of Pope Gregory XVI, when the conclave considered qualifications for a new pope, the urgent question was raised about the church's future direction and its relationship to modern states. On top of that, the old custom of cardinals being allowed to veto a certain candidate,[4] on behalf of their respective nation and its political powers, made this conclave's papal election a highly politicized one. Many foreign cardinals simply decided not to attend the conclave. At its start, only 46 out of 62 cardinals were present. The two main *papabili* at the time were Luigi Emmanuele Niccolo Lambruschini, Vatican Secretary of State, and Giovanni Mastai-Ferretti, bishop of Imola and cardinal-priest of Santi Marcellino e Pietro. The cardinals elected Mastai-Ferretti. Their choice was governed by several factors, and not in the least by the tradition that no Vatican State Secretary was to be elected pope; but more important was the desire living within the college of cardinals for a change of course after Pope Gregory XVI.

Cardinal Mastai-Ferretti, who took the name of Pius IX, had, up until then, been mildly critical of Gregory XVI's policies. Soon, Pius IX made it quite clear that he was serious about a change. Without using the term, a striking attempt at *aggiornamento* took place. Embracing the modern

[4] See Joseph F. Kelly, *The Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church: A History* (Collegeville, 2009), p. 2.

world, the pope had streetlights installed in the City of Rome, dropped the obligation that Jews in Papal territories must attend a Christian prayer service once weekly; and he initiated a new tax policy promoting trade, etc.

After taking these early steps, *Pio Nono* appeared to be a moderately liberal pope, with keen attentiveness to pastoral matters, and high esteem for the role of laity in the church. He even welcomed lay representatives into Vatican administration. Several European leaders applauded this new way of doing things, at the top of the Catholic Church; and *Risorgimento* leader Mazzini had high hopes the pope would help in establishing a unified Italian State. Some observers, like Vincenzo Gioberti, even considered Pius IX as a possible future leader for such a state. Gioberti expressed these hopes in his two-volume work *Del primate morale e civile degli Italiani*.[5] All this would change drastically, however, after the wave of European Revolutions in 1848. Along with the political upheaval, theological tempers would also fly. After the French Revolution, Enlightenment philosophy had spread rapidly throughout Europe, triggering new developments in theology. On both fronts, Pius IX felt compelled to react.

1.2. *Early Nineteenth-Century Currents and Developments in Theology*

The aftermath of the Enlightenment brought both political and ideological turmoil; and shook as well the theological landscape, in the first half of the nineteenth century, where some thinkers began proposing a "theology of reason" or a "rational theology." Soon, however, counter reactions sprang up on several fronts, many of them occurring under the overarching framework now known as "Romanticism." Romanticism includes many currents and movements. In some milieus the eighteenth-century emphasis on rationality was no longer perceived as liberating. It was seen, rather, as a negative factor oppressing religion and spirituality.

In artistic circles, Romanticism's emphasis on emotion over rationality was stressed more and more. One thinks, for example, of the current

[5] Vincenzo Gioberti, *Del primate morale e civile degli Italiani* (Brussels, 1843). Gioberti was known for upkeeping a longstanding polemical debate with Antonio Rosmini, the founder of the Institute of Charity, for the latter's theory of the ideal of being, claiming that it led to subjectivism. For background see a.o. *Vincenzo Gioberti e il panteismo*, ed. Pier Paolo Ottonello (Rome, 2005). The quarrel would have a longstanding impact, and the thought of both Gioberti and Rosmini remains highly influential in twentieth century theology. On this, see Thomas Guarino's study 'Rosmini, Ratzinger and Kuhn: Observations on a note by the Doctrinal Congregation,' *TS* 64 (2003), 43.

that grew out of the German artistic *Sturm und Drang* movement, which featured poets and writers such as Friedrich Schiller and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. Goethe's novel *The Sorrows of Young Werther*[6] had young men throughout Europe emulating its protagonist—a young artist with a very sensitive and passionate temperament. In music, one thinks of composers like Ludwig von Beethoven, Richard Wagner, Franz Liszt, and Hector Berlioz. Romanticism emphasized the self, creativity, imagination, and the value of art. Much of this stood in contrast to the Enlightenment emphasis on rationalism and empiricism. Philosophically speaking, Romanticism represented a shift from the objective to the subjective, a shift which had major implications for theology and church life.

Particularly in German-speaking areas, Romanticism would become strongly linked with idealist philosophies. In this respect, one thinks of philosophers such as Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Friedrich von Schelling, and Friedrich Schleiermacher. In the French speaking world, one thinks of the influence of writers in the social, religious, and political field like Chateaubriand, Bonald, and Lamennais, just to name a few. Theologically, the German *Tübinger Schule* took on great importance with the work of authors such as Drey and Möhler. And in England, Romanticism was marked by the writings of Keble, and later overshadowed by John Henry Newman.

In what follows we will present some important personalities for this period and their significance for future theological and ecclesiastical developments.

1.3. *The Rise of Traditionalism*

In France, the Counter-Enlightenment movement gradually turned into a counter-revolution movement. Romanticist thought and the notion of restoring the *Ancien régime* went hand in hand. There was a strong longing for a return to pre-revolutionary France, with the restoration of the monarchy, linked with the restoration of the power of the church, that had been so strongly attacked by the French revolutionaries. In sum, in intellectual milieus there developed a strong attachment to the "ancient" tradition, in what is often described as "traditionalism."

---

[6] Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* (Leipzig, 1774). Together, in 1797, Goethe and Schiller had taken much pleasure in composing their notorious collection of *Xenien*, criticizing the German "Modephilosophie." See Goethe, *Werke*, Vol. 1: *Gedichte und Epen*, ed. Erich Trunz (Munich, 1996), pp. 208–34.

At this juncture, some names deserve particular attention, since they shaped the Catholic debate and thought about the nature of the act of faith, in the post-Kantian era.[7] Louis de Bonald,[8] for a start, had written his *Théorie du pouvoir politique et religieux dans la société civile* already in 1796;[9] and in 1830 he published his *Méditations politiques*, pondering his own positions and his career.[10] In his writings, Bonald promoted Christendom as visibly present and socially active, rather than metaphysically defined. Precisely for this reason, he will be honored by the twentieth-century sociologist Émile Durkheim as one of the founders of social anthropology. Bonald's main concern lay with the reorganization of a society lost after the French Revolution. He would later become one of the influences behind the *Mission de France*, a movement founded by Cardinal Emmanuel Suhard, which stood for a re-Christianizing of French society. In his juridical and political writings, Bonald—who was seen as an important French royalist—strongly stressed the importance of authority, claiming, in opposition to political Enlightenment thinkers such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and his social contract-theory, that the "authority of evidence" should be replaced by the "evidence of authority." Divine authority was, for him, the foundation for all social and political thought. Although neglected for a longtime, current research suggests that Bonald was in fact an important political thinker, who attempted to prove the essential correspondence between civil society and the religious community, by entering into a solid politico-theological dialogue with rationalism. Bonald did so in a lengthy treatise in which he attempted to prove a fundamental agreement between Catholic dogma and reason, thus reclaiming the Christian position as central to any philosophical and political system.[11]

Another influential religious thinker who promoted reactionary political thought, and who kept a longstanding correspondence with Bonald, was Joseph de Maistre. For Maistre too, the notion of authority was at the

---

[7] For a survey of the theme, see Roger Aubert, *Le problème de l'acte de foi: Données traditionnelles et résultats des controverses récentes* (Louvain and Paris, 1954).

[8] Bonald's son, Louis-Jacques-Maurice de Bonald, was a strong defender of ultramontanism and cardinal archbishop of Lyon in the years 1841 to 1870. He would defend his father's ideas and attack French Gallicanism heavily.

[9] Louis de Bonald, *Théorie du pouvoir politique et religieux dans la société civile, démontrée par le raisonnement et par l'histoire* (Paris, 1796).

[10] See Jacques-Paul Migne's edition of the *Oeuvres complètes de M. de Bonald*, Vol. 3 (Paris, 1859).

[11] This becomes clear from the very recent edition of a previously unknown manuscript by Bonald, entitled *Réflexions sur l'accord des dogmes avec la raison*, ed. Vincent Bouat [La nuit surveillée] (Paris, 2012).

core of his ideas, and Bonald's ideas served as a philosophical undercurrent for Maistre's project. He was a strong advocate of papal authority, stressing the notion of papal infallibility. His 1819 book *Du Pape*,[12] would later become the gospel for ultramontanist theologians, published in various reprint editions in the late 1860s, it constituted an important background factor for the conciliar definition of 1870, which we will discuss at length in this chapter. Maistre's thinking held immediate importance, stressing as it did the necessary link between church power and civil power, in terms of theocracy. Maistre condemned any revolutionary action attempting to separate church and state. Society, for him, was to be organized in a hierarchical manner, with the church as the supreme power, since it represents God's power in the world. In that sense, state power must be understood not only as secondary, but also derivative from the divine power granted to the Supreme Pontiff.

Also prominent in French Post Enlightenment thought was François-René de Chateaubriand. Chateaubriand published his *Le génie du christianisme*[13] in 1802, paving the way for what he dubbed a "positive apologetics." To demonstrate the supremacy of Christendom, and its divine origins, he turned to the world of art, combining the notions of the "traditional" with the artistic notion of the "sublime." Chateaubriand used these terms to describe Christian art as an illustration and imagination of the Word Incarnate, and also gave ample attention to the importance of Christian Romantic literature. At the same time Chateaubriand focused greatly on the importance of active charity: Christian hospitals, houses for the elderly, service to the poor, etc. All of these elements were, in his view, crucial to a reorganization of society on the basis of the Gospel, rather than on Enlightenment values and principles. These two paths—

---

[12] After the appearance in 1816 of his French translation of Plutarch's treatise *On the Delay of Divine Justice in the Punishment of the Guilty*, in 1819 Maistre published *Du Pape* (On the pope), the most complete exposition of his authoritarian conception of politics. Joseph de Maistre, *Du Pape* (Lyon and Paris, 1819). On Maistre and (post-)revolutionary philosophy, see the recent book *Joseph de Maistre and the Legacy of Enlightenment*, ed. Carolina Armenteros and Richard A. Lebrun [Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 1] (Oxford, 2011). On his life and thought, see Franck Lafage, *Le comte Joseph de Maistre, 1753–1821: Itinéraire intellectuel d'un théologien de la politique* [Chemins de la mémoire] (Paris, 1998).

[13] François-René de Chateaubriand, *Le génie du christianisme* (Paris, 1802). For a critically edited version see Chateaubriand, *Essai sur les Révolutions: Génie du christianisme*. Texte établi, présenté et annoté par Maurice Regard [Bibliothèque de la pléiade 272] (Paris, 1978). Chateaubriand wrote the book during his exile in England in the 1790s as a defense of the Catholic faith.

the artistic and the social—constitute the core of his positive apologetics and aim at demonstrating the civilizing power of Christianity.

While the former names may have sounded unfamiliar to twenty-first century ears, the name of Hugues-Félicité de Lamennais should ring a bell. Lamennais figures among the most notorious voices of nineteenth-century Catholicism. Aged 22, he converted to Catholicism, and later became a Catholic priest. Lamennais was to become highly influential, both in the religious and the political domains. In the second and third decades of the century, he wrote his three-volume *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion*.[14] In these early writings, Lamennais defended a medieval model of the church, recapturing its central position at all levels of society, in order to serve the "common good." Precisely the attention for the common good, combined with the return to the medieval traditional model, did imply some consequences for Lamennais's position on the monarchic view of hierarchy and the papacy. On several occasions, Lamennais petitioned Pope Gregory XVI to shift the focus of Christendom toward its role in societal service: He stressed that the church should be concerned with the poor and the weak, and should be working to advance human freedom. This stress on human freedom resulted in actions favoring freedom of press and freedom of opinion, which were quickly picked up by liberal Catholics and found their way into the aforementioned 1831 Belgian constitution. It also increasingly led Lamennais to distance himself from Rome and from Roman centralism.

Over time, Lamennais started reacting against tendencies towards monarchism in the Catholic hierarchy. This criticism eventually brought him into conflict with the hierarchy. With some other members of the *L'Avenir*[15] group, such as Lacordaire and Montalembert, he represented a traditionalist brand of liberal Catholicism, which would be condemned in *Mirari vos*. But the process did not end there. Two years after the encyclical's

[14] Hugues-Félicité Robert de Lamennais, *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion* (Paris, 1817–23). Also see a recent edition of Lamennais's work, *De la différence en matière de religion*, ed. Philippe Riviale [À la recherche des sciences sociales] (Paris, 2007).

[15] The *L'Avenir* movement of liberal Catholicism was initiated in France by Lamennais with the support of Henri-Dominique Lacordaire, Charles-Forbes René de Montalembert, and Olympe-Philippe Gerbet, bishop of Perpignan. A parallel movement arose in Belgium, led by François de Méan, Archbishop of Mechelen, and his vicar general Engelbert Sterckx. Lamennais founded the newspaper *L'Avenir*. The first issue appeared on 16 October 1830, and initiated a series of articles with a wide spread. See a.o. Ruth L. White, *L'Avenir de La Mennais: Son rôle dans la presse de son temps* [Bibliothèque française et romane: Série c: Études littéraires 42] (Paris, 1974).

appearance, in 1834, Lamennais published his *Paroles d'un croyant*,[16] and ultimately left the Catholic Church. Pope Gregory XVI condemned his book in the encyclical *Singulari nos*,[17] lamenting "the madness of human reason seeking novelty and contrary to the warning of the Apostle seeking to know more than it is necessary to know and to find truth outside the Catholic Church."[18] This very thought, the idea that truth cannot be found outside the Catholic Church, will prevail, as we will see, in official Catholic discourse for many decades, and will also dominate some twentieth-century debates.

Let us then turn to one of the other prominent members of the *L'Avenir* group—which was ultimately condemned in *Mirari vos*. After 1832, Henri-Dominique Lacordaire increasingly entered into conflict with his former ally Lamennais. Ultimately, not intending to turn his back on the Church, Lacordaire publicly expressed his objections to Lamennais in his 1834 work *Considérations sur le système philosophique de M. de Lamennais*.[19] Thereafter, Lacordaire launched his Lenten conferences in Paris, offering his views on religious, philosophical, and social affairs to the wider public for more than a decade. The development of ideas led him toward religious life; and in 1839 he entered the Dominican Order, which he helped re-establish in France.[20]

In this way, Lacordaire's 1839 *Mémoire pour le rétablissement de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs en France* turned out to be an important step both for his personal development and for the evolution of religious life in France.[21] After the new French legislation on education in 1850, his ideas led to the foundation of the so-called "Third Order," stressing the importance of Catholic youth formation and education. Lacordaire's career was

---

16 Hugues-Félicité de Lamennais, *Paroles d'un croyant* (Paris, 1833).

17 Gregory XVI, 'Singulari nos (subtitled "On the Errors of Lamennais," issued on June 25, 1834),' *Acta Gregorii Papae XVI*, 1:434. These early nineteenth-century papal documents did not appear in the *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, since the latter were established only in 1865 by Pius IX. See Marie Joseph Le Guillou and Louis Le Guillou, *La condamnation de Lamennais* (Paris, 1982).

18 Cf. John Thomas Noonan, *The Lustre of Our Country: The American Experience of Religious Freedom* (Berkeley, 1998), p. 360.

19 Henri-Dominique Lacordaire, *Considérations sur le système philosophique de M. de La Mennais* (Paris, 1834).

20 The proces can be followed closely when glancing through Lacordaire's elaborate correspondence, now published in two volumes as Henri-Dominique Lacordaire, *Correspondance*, Vol 1: 1816–1839, Vol. 2: 1839–1846, ed. Guy Bedouelle and Christoph-Alois Martin (Paris, 2001).

21 Henri-Dominique Lacordaire, *Mémoire pour le rétablissement en France de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs* (Paris, 1839).

quite varied, and even showed him entering political life for a brief period. Besides holding a seat in the French *Assemblée constituante*, he was also editor of the periodical *L'Ère nouvelle*, in which he defended his apologetics and advocated a return to medieval models of societal organization, stressing that the structure of church is the structure willed by God and therefore most apt for ruling society.[22]

Closely linked to these French traditionalist authors, and often linked to the more extreme wings of traditionalist thought—which tended to fully reduce Catholic tradition to the magisterium—, one also finds the fideist thinkers. Embedded in Romanticist thought, their reaction against the stress on "rationality" in Enlightenment theological discourse shifted the pendulum to the other extreme. Fideists rejected the value of reason altogether and stressed the act of faith as a purely irrational and often emotionally motivated act. Only devotional faith and obeisance would lead to true knowledge. However, precisely this stress on a blind leap of faith would turn out to be their Achilles' heel. Their position came dangerously close to the ancient Protestant principle of *sola fide*; and the fideist position, however nuanced in same cases, was soon rejected by the hierarchy. Because of their importance in this line of thought, we point to Bautain and Bonnetty as two major representatives.

Initially, Louis Bautain was strongly influenced by Lamennais, but he too evolved into a brand of traditionalism that ultimately proved irreconcilable with the views of the church. In his 1835 *Philosophie du christianisme*[23] he expressed his perspective most clearly. According to Bautain metaphysics cannot be based on individual or on common rationality. Instead, sound metaphysics must be founded solely on "divine reasoning," as it is expressed in revelation. This way of discarding human rationality leads, in his thought world, to the assertion that only a blind leap of faith in what is divinely revealed and authoritatively presented by the church's magisterium, leads to true knowledge, and thus brings us to the truth. Ultimately, the truth cannot be reached or comprehended in its fullness by human rational capacity.

According to Bautain humans have two ways of reaching divine truth: an immediate way (through the direct experience of divine revelations and

---

[22] On this, see in particular the collection of texts in *L'église dans l'oeuvre du père Lacordaire*, ed. Yvonne Frontier and Henri-Marie Féret [Unam sanctam 45] (Paris, 1963). Also see the edition of his *Pensées*, by the same editors [Bibliothèque ecclesia] (Paris, 1961).

[23] Louis-Eugène-Marie Bautain, *Philosophie du christianisme* (Strasbourg and Paris, 1835).

inspiration) and a mediated way (through the acceptance of the accounts of such revelations in the Scriptures and Tradition). Either option involves obedience to revealed truth, without an element of *ratio.* Finally, it should be said that his thought does not rule out the element of charity. On the contrary, Bautain stressed, somewhat opposite to classic Calvinist doctrine, that truth can only be reached when one lives and acts in charity. Metaphysics is therefore impossible without the act of Christian love. Bautain's positions were condemned, just as those of Augustin Bonnetty—known as the founder of the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne*[24] in 1830. In fact, Bonnetty took Bautain's positions to a bit further.

Just as Bautain, Bonnetty (who also co-edited the periodical *L'Univers catholique*, launched in Paris in 1833) gave little or no credit to the value of human reason and stressed the primordial and principle value of the divine *ratio*, only attainable via an irrational act of faith. This led the Sacred Congregation of the Index to demand that he subscribe to a list of four theses highlighting the principles of sound Catholic theology, which make clear what the core of the debate was all about: Bonnetty was asked to acknowledge that there was no conflict between faith and reason, that faith was posterior to reason, and that reason leads to faith with the help of revelation and grace.

1.4. *The German Confederation*

As with Italy, early nineteenth-century Germany was not a unified country. Instead it was made up of a patchwork of local states united in the German Confederation, following the 1815 Congress of Vienna—organized by Prussia, Russia, the United Kingdom and Austria, in order to rearrange Europe's power balances after the defeat of Napoleon I in 1815. After the 1848 revolutions this confederation was briefly dissolved, but re-instated in 1850.

Here too, the Post Enlightenment dispute on the relationship between church, faith, and reason had become a sharply debated issue in the German speaking world, already since the eighteenth century. At that time, the impact of the writings of Febronius (pseudonym for Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim, Coadjutor Bishop of the Diocese of Trier) on theological thought was massive, and it is still felt throughout the nineteenth century. Even while admitting a papal primacy, Febronianism claimed that the

[24] *Annales de philosophie chrétienne*, ed. Augustin Bonnetty, Charles Denis, Lucien Laberthonnière (Paris, 1830–79).

church was not, by nature, a monarchic institution and that all authority and power in the Roman Catholic Church was not in the hands of the Roman Pontiff alone. In this line of thought the role of the bishops as the pope's "*conjudices*" was deemed crucial; and strong emphasis was put on the importance of ecumenical councils, as binding for the pope, and superseding the pope's doctrinal authority. Notwithstanding negative reactions from Rome, remnants of Febronius's mid eighteenth-century legacy lived on strongly in Germany's political classes, and had at first been tacitly supported by Maria-Theresia, and later applied openly under Josephinist rule. This heritage constituted the broad horizon against which some of the key areas of theological debate were carried on in the early nineteenth-century context of high ecclesiastical and university milieus.

Intellectual protagonists such as the bishop and politician Karl Theodor von Dalberg—a personal acquaintance of Goethe and Schiller—carried the legacy of Febronianism into the nineteenth century,[25] influencing the academic discourse that would be developed at the universities of Tübingen and Munich. Therefore, what follows will consist of a brief analysis of the *Tübinger Schule* and the *Münchener Schule*, and their major protagonists. In general, the theologians of the Catholic *Tübinger Schule* were situated within the overall context of Romanticism.[26] The atmosphere of their thought world was dominated by fundamental concepts such as *Geist, Leben*, and *mystischer Sinn*. Rather anti-rationalist notions also circled around the ideas of the people (*Volk*) and notions of organic growth and the working of the Spirit in people and in history. The philosophical writings of Schelling and Schleiermacher, and certainly the Hegelian philosophy of history—understood in terms of thesis-antithesis and the ever reshaping of a newer and higher synthesis—as a dynamic process guided by the spirit, were of crucial importance. Inspired by their Protestant colleagues, Catholic theologians sought to integrate these philosophical perspectives into their own work. These efforts were made possible thanks

[25] Dalberg, a prominent figure under the Holy German Empire, and later rector at the Karls-Universität, also supported early nineteenth-century Catholic reform thinkers such as Ignaz von Wessenberg. See in this regard, *Kirche und Aufklärung: Ignaz Heinrich von Wessenberg 1774–1860*, ed. Klaus Schatz and Karl-Heinz Braun [Schriftenreihe der katholische Akademie der Erzdiözese Freiburg] (Munich, 1989).

[26] On the importance and development of the Catholic Tübingers, see the recent and excellent study of Stefan Warthmann, *Die katholische Tübinger Schule: Zur Geschichte Ihrer Wahrnehmung* [Contubernium: Tübinger Beiträge zur Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte 75] (Stuttgart, 2011).

to the fact that many philosophers themselves redirected their work toward Christianity. While in France, the accent was put on the political and social realm, the Germans developed a remarkable integration of theological and philosophical thought. This situation brought along a very particular rationale, which would have its own effect on later church historical and theological developments.

In the case of the Tübingen School, theologians were trying to integrate the experience of fragmented and ruptured events of history and the longing for a central and lingering theory, to retrieve unity. In theological terms, this was translated into attention to Christ as the unique Word of God Incarnate, being in tension with the manifold ways this Word has been expressed in the history of Christianity. As a result, the Tübingen theologians looked for a new way of dealing with Christian tradition and the past. They integrated not only contemporary philosophical currents, but, at the same time, the developments that had taken place in the Reformed traditions and were represented in the evangelical faculty at Tübingen. These Protestant authors already had a tradition of focusing on church history and, mainly the earlier origins of Christian faith in the Bible and the Church Fathers, as sources for theology.

Famously known as the founder of the Catholic Tübingen School is Johann Sebastian von Drey. Drey was ordained to the priesthood in 1801, and was active for several years as a parish priest; and he held several professorial chairs. In 1817 Drey arrived at Tübingen, and founded the *Tübinger theologische Quartalschrift* two years later. In that same year he drafted his *Kurze Einleitung in das Studium der Theologie.*[27] This work deserves particular attention. Not only did it contribute to the rising genre of the theological encyclopedia, typical of the early nineteenth century; but it also tried to sketch a model for a contemporary university-level theological education and offer the basis for a new Catholic faculty. Drey's work would prove, therefore, to be influential both on the formal level of university education for Catholic theologians, and on the content level of theological thought.

---

[27] Johann Sebastian von Drey, *Kurze Einleitung in das Studium der Theologie mit Rücksicht auf den wissenschaftlichen Standpunkt und das katholische System* (Tübingen, 1819). It has been critically edited some years ago by Max Seckler (Tübingen, 2007), and recently appeared in an English translation as Johann Sebastian von Drey, *Brief Introduction to the Study of Theology with Reference to the Scientific Standpoint and the Catholic System*, trans. and ed. Michael J. Himes [Notre Dame Studies in Theology 1] (Notre Dame and London, 1994).

In theological thought, his main importance was in the introduction of historical thinking—much in the line with Schelling, Hegel and Schleiermacher—as a central element in Catholic teaching. Church history became a theological discipline. Up until that era, most Catholic faculties did not have chairs in church history; and the tradition of the church had only been studied within the framework of dogmatic theology. By having historiography inserted into the theological curriculum, Drey succeeded in drastically altering the very nature and method of Catholic theology. Much in line with Romanticism, he argued that Christianity is not only based on revelation, but that Christian tradition is also to be understood as a gradual process of disclosure of that revelation. This changed the hermeneutics of dogma, to the extent that dogmatic definitions should henceforth be understood against the background of the broader process of tradition. The notion of tradition was no longer merely captured as something supra-historical, but rather as an organic and dynamic aspect of Christian faith in its development.

The impact of this theological renewal was of lasting importance; and the publication of Drey's second volume of the *Apologetik*—which appeared in 1843 and was entitled *Die Religion in ihren Geschichtlichen Entwicklung bis zu ihrer Vollendung durch die Offenbarung in Christus*—was a true event for theological development. It made Drey the first Catholic theologian to publish a full course in *Dogmengeschichte*. Note here that the German term *Geschichte* is to be distinguished from the German word *Historie*, the latter pointing to a mere summing up of historical events and facts, while the first focuses more interest on understanding the evolution and process behind the encyclopedic facts. Drey's interest in integrating historical thinking into theological discourse was clearly linked with the notion of *Geschichte*; all along his work was a constant endeavor to demonstrate and defend the idea that Christianity alone is to be regarded as the perfect religion, and that Catholicism is the most authentic form of the Christian religion. His main work in this perspective is entitled *Die Apologetik als wissenschaftliche Nachweisung der Göttlichkeit des Christentums*. The title already reveals the apologetical character of his writings; and it should be mentioned that on several occasions he entered into discussion with Reformed theologians, accusing them of denying the value of tradition and attacking the Protestant *sola scriptura* principle.

Another famous representative of this school was Johann Adam Möhler. He had a longstanding career before he became a professor at Tübingen in 1826, only to depart for Munich in 1835. In these years he published two

books entitled *Die Einheit der Kirche*[28] and *Symbolik*, both of which have become standard works in the history of theology. Many other Möhler writings were collected and published, after his death, by Ignaz von Döllinger. Möhler's main concern was a reframing of the theology of the church. Reacting to the Enlightenment and to the type of scholasticism that was often taught at German seminaries, he developed an ecclesiology which presented the church as a dynamic organism, whose liveliness is warranted by its being guided by the Holy Spirit. In that sense, Möhler was an advocate of a new vision of the notion of tradition, linked with the church's historical development. He integrated historical reasoning into ecclesiological thought, and showed himself strongly influenced by the church fathers.

As a result of this rediscovery of patristic discourse and theology, Möhler's ecclesiology remained sufficiently open to elements of mysticism and spirituality, as well as being Christocentric. In sum: he presented the church as the community of the Word Incarnate whose unity is guaranteed by the Spirit. The church, in this picture, is defined as the continuation of Christ's salvific work in history, guided by the Spirit. This pneumatological aspect of his ecclesiological project gave Möhler ample room to accept "novelty" in church history and to accept the importance of the Catholic hierarchy as a normative instance for Catholic thinking. He too entered into dispute with well-known theologians such as Ferdinand Christian Baur from the Protestant *Tübinger Schule*, who attacked Möhler's *Symbolik* in his 1833 book *Der Gegensatz des Katholizismus und Protestantismus*.[29]

An important author in the second generation of the Catholic *Tübinger Schule* is found in Johannes Evangelist von Kuhn. He started out as an exegete and published in the field of biblical hermeneutics. As many others in his day, he published a "Life of Jesus." Kuhn's *Leben Jesu*[30] tried to illustrate the influence of Judaism on Jesus' psychology, and thereby argued against several elements in the famous *Das Leben Jesu* published

---

[28] Johann Adam Möhler, *Die Einheit der Kirche* (Tübingen, 1825); published in English as *Unity in the Church or the Principle of Catholicism Presented in the Spirit of the Church Fathers of the First Three Centuries*, ed. Peter C. Erb (Washington, 1994); *Symbolik* (Tübingen, 1832).

[29] Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Der Gegensatz des Katholizismus und Protestantismus* (Tübingen, 1833).

[30] Johannes von Kuhn, *Das Leben Jesu wissenschaftlich bearbeitet* (Mainz, 1838).

by David Friedrich Strauss in 1835.[31] Kuhn's way of approaching one of the central Post Enlightenment themes in christian theology—the reconciliation of faith and reason—was influenced largely by Hegelian dialectics. He sought to present philosophical reasoning (*thesis*) over against Christian thinking (*antithesis*) in an initial movement, only to integrate them into a higher *synthesis* of both. This enabled him to combine notions of reason with elements of intuition and emotion. In his thinking he devoted ample attention to the importance of Christian conscience, which brought him rather close to the thought of John Henry Newman.

Whereas the role and influence of the *Tübinger Schule* was only felt on a broader scale in the period before and during the Second Vatican Council, the professors of the *Münchener Schule* were far more influential on the First Vatican Council. Franz von Baader ranks among the more prominent voices of the era, engaged in a strong critique of Cartesian philosophy and its dualist philosophical scission of rational man (*cogito ergo sum*) from the outside world. Baader rejected this metaphysical dualism, and sought to reposition man within God's salvation economy. Therefore he turned Descartes's famous phrase into a passive construction, which sounded: *cogitor* (*Deo*) *ergo sum* (I am cognized (by God), therefore I am).[32] A typical exponent of Romanticist theosophy, Baader was among the greatest promoters of Catholic restoration up until the middle of the nineteenth century. He became a professor of philosophy at Munich in 1826 and—originally educated as a physician—soon became known as an influential anti-rationalist, inspired by Hegel and Schelling.

Johann Joseph Görres also belonged to the leading Catholic philosophers and historians at Munich, where he frequented the same intellectual milieus as Baader. He too was attracted to theosophical speculation, and worked mainly in the field of philosophy of history.[33] Görres devoted much attention to Christian mysticism, drafting his magnum opus

---

[31] David Friedrich Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu* (Tübingen, 1835–36). Strauss wrote the book when he was twenty-seven years old. The complete original title of this work is *Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet*. It was translated from the fourth German edition into English by George Eliot and published with the title *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined* (London, 1846).

[32] On Baader's philosophy, see *Die Philosophie, Theologie und Gnosis Franz von Baaders*, ed. Peter Koslowski (Vienna, 1993). An excellent study of Baader's critique of modernity was published by Joris Geldhof, 'Cogitor ergo sum: On the Meaning and Relevance of Baader's Theological Critique of Descartes,' *Modern Theology* 21 (2005), 237–51.

[33] Frederick C. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*. Vol. 7: *Modern Philosophy: From the Post-Kantian Idealists to Marx, Kierkegaard and Nietzsche* (New York, 1994), p. 145.

Die christliche Mystik,[34] written in the period of 1836 to 1842. Reflecting on mysticism, he developed a holistic theory of reality being imbedded in religion. This also led him to devote great attention to the social mission of the church and its need to care for the poor and the weak.

The social attention of scholars like Baader and Görres would gain impact outside of the academic circles, too. It was shared by other contemporaries, such as Emmanuel von Ketteler.[35] Ketteler had been a student of Görres at the University of Münich, and would become an important Catholic protagonist in the German Confederation. In the revolutionary year of 1848, he was elected a member of the Frankfurt parliament, and two years later he was appointed Bishop of the Diocese of Mainz. Even stronger than Görres, he was committed to the social role of the Catholic Church, calling for an apologetics with a double focus, on both Christ and the church. Both, he argued, should constitute the basis for social order. Members of the clergy in his diocese were strongly urged to practice Christ's love in their everyday ministry with the worker class. At Vatican I, Ketteler counted among those who distanced themselves from the doctrine of papal infallibility, just like that other famous nineteenth-century German theologian, Ignaz von Döllinger, with whom Ketteler had studied in Munich.

Often seen as one of the best representatives of the German "historical" school of theology, the name of Döllinger still resonates strongly. As of 1826, Döllinger was a professor at Munich, and his work continually entangled him in wider church politics. Initially, Döllinger was a committed ultramontanist, much under the influence of the aforementioned Joseph de Maistre. Later on, he evolved away from this stance, and eventually criticized Maistre's *Du Pape* on historical grounds. Along this path, Döllinger became critical of Roman monarchic tendencies, which resulted in strong reactions against declarations such as the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and, in 1870, the dogma of papal infallibility, which Döllinger utterly rejected. He thereupon was excommunicated by the Archbishop of Munich; and, as a reaction, he became closely tied to (though never officially joined) the Old Catholic Church. It had originated in 1724 but received a new group of members after 1870, mainly in the German speaking world. Among Döllinger's most important works are

---

[34] Johann Joseph von Görres, *Christliche Mystik* (Munich, 1836–42).

[35] An excellent biography was written by the German Church historian Erwin Iserloh, *Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, 1811–1877* [Beiträge zur Katholizismusforschung A: Quellentexte zur Geschichte des Katholizismus 4] (Paderborn, 1990).

his *Christentum und Kirche*[36] and the more polemic *Kirche und Kirchen: Papsttum und Kirchenstaat*,[37] reacting openly against Pius IX's attitude in the *Roman Question* and arguing strongly on the basis of historical scholarship. Döllinger put much energy into combating ultramontanism and papal centralism; and he argued for a German national church, somewhat in line with French Gallicanism.[38]

Next to these Munich protagonists, three other German authors, much less known to the wider public today, played a central role in the evolving debates of their time on the relationship between faith and reason, an ever-returning theme throughout nineteenth- and twentieth-century theology and philosophy. Particularly important among them was Georg Hermes, professor at Münster and Bonn. Hermes attempted to reconcile Enlightenment rationalism with Christian thought. Acknowledging reason as the sole guide given to humanity by God, he distinguished between two types of faith: the faith of the heart and the faith of reason. He put all emphasis on the latter and went on to prove the rational value of Christian thinking. Hermes was greatly inspired by Kant and Fichte's philosophical systems and stressed the fact that, to human rational capacities, religious truths can only appear in a natural and/or symbolic order. As a result, Hermes tended to acknowledge Catholic dogma, but in the line of Kant's critique of pure reason, tended to reduce them to their anthropological significance. This proved highly problematic, and while Hermes tried to prove the rational necessity of Christian truth claims, he was attacked for his philosophical method. In 1835 his ideas were condemned by Pope Gregory XVI and later again by Pius IX and some of the *Roman School* Jesuit theologians, such as Perrone and Kleutgen. As of 1830, the theologians of the Jesuit-led *Collegio Romano* had become highly influen-

---

[36] Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger, *Christentum und Kirche* (Munich, 1860).

[37] Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger, *Kirche und Kirchen: Papsttum und Kirchenstaat* (Munich, 1861). On Döllinger's later period in life and his connection to the Old Catholic Church, see Franz Xaver Bischof, *Theologie und Geschichte: Ignaz von Döllinger in der zweiten Hälfte seines Lebens: Ein Beitrag zu seiner Biographie* [Münchener kirchenhistorische Studien 9] (Stuttgart, 1997).

[38] Gallicanism defines a group of religious opinions that was for some time peculiar to the church in France. Gallicanism tended to restrain the pope's authority in favor of that of bishops and the people's representatives in the State, or the monarch. These opinions were in strong opposition to ultramontanism with its strong support of papal superiority over any civil authority. John McGreevy, University of Notre Dame professor, defines it as "the notion that national customs might trump Roman (Catholic Church) regulations." John McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom*, (New York, 2003), p. 26.

tial in Catholic theological circles. Jesuits like Giovanni Perrone played a crucial role in official Roman reactions against the theological positions of Bautain and Hermes.[39]

In this context of increasingly strong reactions from Roman scholastic theologians, Anton Günther[40] is also worth mentioning. Whereas the Roman Jesuits could have some sympathy for the thinking of theologians such as Drey, Günther was not greatly appreciated in these milieus. Often mentioned as the instigator of semi-rationalism (an attempt at safeguarding religious principles and truths, but departing from the priority of human rationality), Günther attempted, just as Hermes, to demonstrate the rational necessity of Christian truth and promote the triumph of positive Christianity. On the one hand, following Cartesian as well as post-Kantian philosophical thought, Günther put such emphasis on the individual and rational qualities of the human subject[41] that human thinking appeared no longer in need of historical revelation but arrived at the recognition of religious truths on the basis of purely speculative and rational argumentation. This recognition implied that philosophical faith is primordial. A human's logical capacity, in Günther's thought world, was however, completely split off from ontological or meta-logical human capacity. Thus, Günther ended up in what is described as metaphysical dualism; and, increasingly, his interest in modern philosophy raised suspicions in the same Roman circles that had attacked Hermes years before. On precisely his dualist principle and his reliance on human rationality, he was attacked; and his works were put on the Index of Prohibited Books[42] in 1857, and were again condemned, both in the 1864 *Syllabus of errors* and by the canons of Vatican I.

---

[39] See Gerald A. McCool, *Nineteenth-Century Scholasticism: The Search for a Unitary Method* (New York, 2002), pp. 81–83.

[40] In 1828 Günther began to publish ideas about philosophy and speculative theology in a series of letters: *Vorschule zur speculativen Theologie des positiven Christenthums*. Part I dealt with *'Die Creationstheorie'* and part II with *'Die Incarnationstheorie,'* 1st ed. (Vienna, 1828–9); 2nd ed. (Vienna, 1846–8).

[41] Cf. Bernhard Osswald, *Anton Günther: Theologische Denken im Kontext einer Philosophie der Subjektivität* [Abhandlungen zur Philosophie, Psychologie, Soziologie der Religion, und Ökumenik: N.F. 43] (Paderborn, 1990).

[42] The *Index librorum prohibitorum* (Index of Prohibited Books) was a list of publications prohibited by the Catholic Church. The first version was issued by Pope Paul IV in 1559. The final, the twentieth edition, appeared in 1948. The *Index* was formally abolished on June 14, 1966 by Pope Paul VI.

Another theologian attacked for attempting to offer a "rational" ground for the understanding of Catholic dogma was Jacob Frohschammer. Frohschammer started his academic career in 1850 and became a professor in Munich in 1855. He soon became know as a much more extreme adherent of semi-rationalism. Among others, his work *Über den Ursprung der menschlichen Seele*[43] reveals his semi-rationalist tendencies, since it defended the opinion that human parents are the "authors" of the souls of their children. This position led him to question the supernatural origins of the human soul; and this led to casting doubts about the theology of creation and the relationship between the natural and the supernatural in Catholic theology.

1.5. *The Oxford Movement*

Finally, we wish to mention the influence of Romanticist developments in English Catholicism, which had experienced several waves of oppression since the sixteenth century. The situation of Catholics in England changed, in the middle of the nineteenth century, due to large immigrant populations entering the country. In 1829, as well, the House of Commons allowed Catholics to hold seats in parliament, even when they were still required to take oaths declaring that the pope could not interfere in civil affairs.

Another highly significant development was the Anglican Oxford Movement in the England of the Victorian era. The movement started with a sermon held by John Keble in 1833, under the title "National Apostasy." Keble attacked state interference in the nomination of bishops as well as an increasing indifference and disinterest, on the part of the English people, regarding to the supernatural. In the same year the Tract Movement started, with the publication of a series of pamphlets discussing religious matters. More and more, protagonists of the movement such as John Henry Newman became not only actively engaged but started calling for a *via media* between Protestantism and Catholicism. In this movement, as a result of his study of early Christianity and a long process of study and growing doubt, Newman finally was incapable of identifying the English State church with the "original" and "true" church of Christ. Much as in Möhler's case, patristic sources led him to revise his ideas on the church, as well as on the development of dogma, an aspect that would later come

[43] Jacob Frohschammer, *Ueber den Ursprung der menschlichen Seelen* (Munich, 1854).

to the fore again with the modernist crisis and in the *nouvelle theologie* movement of the mid-twentieth century.

In 1845, the year in which he published his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*,[44] John Henry Newman converted to Roman Catholicism. With his sense of "development," Newman became a key representative of the movement toward a more historical and process-minded view of Christian tradition.[45] In 1847 he became a Catholic priest and founded the first English-speaking Oratory of Saint Philip Neri in Birmingham, England, in 1848. He was also entrusted with the leadership of the recently founded University of Dublin, which led to his work called *The Idea of a University*.[46] Finally in 1870, Newman published his *Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*.[47] In this epistemological treatise, he inquired into the prerequisites for people to assent with any given proposition. Distinguishing between notional comprehension (deductive or concept based understanding of a proposition) and real comprehension (experience based understanding), he stressed the distinction between notional and real assent. The latter is crucial to understanding religious assent in his mind, thereby integrating the rational and the personal or experiential element in religious faith. Newman's interest in understanding the elements involved in human decision-making led him to develop the unique notion of the "illative sense." In his theological writings, Newman also emphasized the role of personal conscience and the importance of imagination as an epistemological category. In spite of an invitation offered to him by bishop William Bernard Ullathorne from Birmingham, Newman did not participate in Vatican I and hardly interfered in the discussions against—such as held by Lord John Acton, a former pupil of Döllinger—or in favor of ultramontanism, the latter position being defended vehemently by the Anglican convert, Cardinal Henry Edward Manning, an active proponent of the Council's declaration of papal infallibility.[48]

---

[44] John Henry Newman, *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (Oxford, 1845). For elaborate background on both the Oxford Movement and the thought world of Keble and Newman, see, *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*, ed. Ian Ker and Terrence Merrigan (Cambridge, 2009).

[45] Cf. Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: A Biography* (Oxford, 1989).

[46] John Henry Newman, *The Idea of a University* (Oxford, 1852 and 1858).

[47] John Henry Newman, *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* (Oxford, 1870).

[48] Cf. James Pereiro, *Cardinal Manning: An Intellectual Biography* (Oxford, 1998).

2. *Ultramontanist Catholicism in the Era of Pius IX*

Before entering into detail regarding the long and greatly influential pontificate of Pope Pius IX,[49] we wish to focus once more on the social and political historical background shaping so many events, in continuation with some of the already mentioned evolutions in motion under Pope Gregory XVI. We will do so, by focusing mainly on the social and political situation in Italy, France, the German Confederation, and the United States of America. As will become clear, these also had important bearings on the theological and church-political developments occurring under this pontiff.

2.1. *Risorgimento Revisited*

At first, the moderate liberal stance adopted by Pius IX, immediately after his election in 1846, made him rather popular in many parts of Europe. It even helped the pope gain the support of political leaders, as he had made it clear he was not against a unified Italian State. Soon the tensions that had existed between Mazzini's *Giovane Italia* and Pope Gregory XVI turned into a sympathetic approach, from the side of the Italian "rebels." One of the first political acts of the new pope was granting amnesty to a large amount of political prisoners.[50] This would last, however, for only two years. After these, the *Roman Question*—the question of the status of the Papal States as well as the broader picture of the church's attitude toward modern states—would remain at the center of Europe's political and religious agenda, only to be ultimately resolved in 1929.[51]

In 1848 everything changed. Pope Pius IX shifted from a democratic liberal openness to the world to a defensive and hostile world attitude.[52] On January 12, 1848, revolutionary riots occurred in the city of Naples, which resulted in the drafting of a liberal constitution for the Neapolitan state. Next, Sardinia followed in its footsteps; and these events set in motion a new chain of political events. In the French capital of Paris, King Louis-Philippe I was forced to flee his palace. In Milan, Berlin, and

---

[49] One of the best studies on Pius IX still remains that of Roger Aubert, *Le Pontificat de Pie IX, 1846–1878* [Histoire de l'église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours 21] (Paris, 1952).

[50] Owen Chadwick, *A History of the Popes, 1830–1914* (Oxford, 1998), p. 64.

[51] We return to the issue later in this book. For recent light on the Roman Question, see the excellent study by Saretta Marotta, 'La questione romana,' in *Cristiani d'Italia: Chiesa, società, stato, 1861–2011*, ed. Alberto Melloni, 2 Vols. (Rome, 2011), pp. 641–54.

[52] See Giacomo Martina, *Il pontificato di Pio IX, 1846–1878*, 3 Vols. (Rome, 1974–91).

Vienna revolutions broke out. A striking exception was the evolution that took place in the Netherlands, where King William II attempted to avoid revolutionary uprisings by nominating a commission of five liberal politicians and thinkers led by Johan Rudolph Thorbecke, asking them to draft a new Constitution for the kingdom.[53] The result was that this Calvinist ruled nation now gave more freedom to the suppressed Catholic population, which in turn gave Pius IX the opportunity to restore the Catholic hierarchy in March 1853, despite strongly negative Protestant protest in the so-called April Movement.[54] Three years earlier, and for other reasons, such as the wave of conversions resulting out of the Oxford Movement, the pope had acted in a similar way and had re-established the Catholic hierarchy in England. Let us now return more specifically to the determinative year of 1848. The revolutionary flood wave inspired a variety of authors. It would provide not only the setting for Gustave Flaubert's novel *L'éducation sentimentale*; but Karl Marx readily interpreted the 1848 revolutions as key examples of class struggle.[55]

The Vatican interpretation would be quite different. On March 14th of that year the pope reacted to the new waves of democratic longing, by installing a two chamber system for the Papal territories. The parliament was to consist of elected members, including lay persons and a second chamber consisting of cardinals appointed by the pope. Laws presented by the first were to be approved by the second . . . For a brief while, democratic rule entered the Catholic Church's headquarters. Soon then, a problem arose from the side of the *Risorgimento* movement.[56] In the Italian north, Venice and Milanese rebellion troops had expelled the Austrian occupying forces. The King of Sardinia declared war against all who stood against Italian unification, and he enlisted Italian forces against the Austrian Empire. Notwithstanding all the sympathy he had earlier received from the *Risorgimento* and *Giovane Italia*, this went too far for the pope.

Pius IX first hesitated and then vehemently refused to participate in this new development for several reasons. Among them was the fact that the pope considered himself also to be the leader of large Catholic

---

[53] Cf. *Handboek Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Kampen, 2006), pp. 646–50.

[54] The Catholic Church in the Netherlands had been missionary territory since 1572. On these events in the Netherlands, see Wim Janse and Jurjen Vis, *Staf en Storm: Het herstel van de bisschoppelijke hiërarchie in Nederland in 1853, actie en reactie* (Hilversum, 2002).

[55] Karl Marx, *Der 18te Brumaire des Louis Napoleons* (New York, 1852).

[56] For more details and background, see Derek Beales and Eugenio F. Biagini, *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy* (London, 2002).

populations under Austrian rule—in particular in the center north of contemporary Italy—and he felt unable to act against them, in his capacity as universal pastor. The pope preferred to use diplomatic channels and even succeeded in obtaining the retreat of all Austrian forces from northern parts of Italy. Nevertheless, members of the *Risorgimento* had begun to consider the pope as no longer their ally but their enemy. The liberal Catholic minister Pellegrino Rossi, appointed by Pius IX, was murdered; and on November 16, 1848, rebel troops entered the *Palazzo del Quirinale*, the papal residence in the heart of Rome. On November 24, 1848, Pope Pius IX had to leave the city and fled to Gaeta, on the Italian coastline. On February 9th of 1849, Mazzini declared the foundation of the Roman Republic. But already in July of that year, the troops of Napoleon III had conquered parts of Rome, and offered a safe return to the pope, at the request of the new King of Sardinia: Vittorio Emmanuele II, who had hoped to secure the sympathy of his Catholic inhabitants. Pope Pius IX returned to Rome on April 12, 1850; but he had become a changed person.

In the future, the new French emperor Napoleon III would collaborate closely and wage war against the Austrian forces. Notwithstanding the return of the pope to Rome, there was another agenda: The King of Sardinia still strove toward Italian unification, supported by the Sardinian Prime Minister Camillo Cavour. The French emperor wished to expand his territories against the German Confederation. Both shared forces and in 1859 they defeated the Austrian troops in the *Battle of Solferino*, resulting in the incorporation of Milan into the Kingdom of Sardinia. They also shared political views on the role of the papacy in the international political field, which became very apparent in a 1859 brochure entitled *Le Pape et le congrès.* This brochure, referring to the diplomatic congress held in Paris in the Spring 1856 and influenced by Napoleonic circles, spread the opinion that diminishing papal territory would have the positive effect of increasing the pope's spiritual and moral power, and his authority: "Plus le territoire sera petit, plus le souverain sera grand."[57] Temporal and eternal power were split, and had become concurrent factors. This met with staunch opposition from many Catholics, who believed that the pope had the right to possess his own territory.

In reaction to all of the above, the pope decided to mobilize his own army, the so-called papal *zouaves*: volunteers from the Papal States, members of the Swiss Guard, and Catholic volunteers from several countries

[57] Louis Étienne Arthur du Breuil, *Le Pape et le Congrès* (Paris, 1859).

who had joined forces to defend the pope.[58] This led to a series of armed conflicts on the frontiers of the Papal States between the pontifical army and a league of forces consisting of troops led by the republican general Giuseppe Garibaldi and the government troops of Cavour. By the beginning of the year 1861, only a fifth of the papal territories remained under the pope's control and Garibaldi's republican forces had conquered the Kingdom of Sicily, which had been supportive of the pope.

On March 17, 1861 the *Risorgimento* movement reached another climax: Vittorio Emanuele was enthroned as the new king of all Italy. The same day, Cavour coined the famous phrase *Chiesa libera nello stato libero* (a free church in a free state).[59] The pope was asked to give up the remaining papal territories and hand them over to the Italian government, in exchange for the unconditional freedom of the church in Italy. Pope Pius IX staunchly refused. A convention was organized in September 1861 with the pope, Napoleon III (who still had some remaining troops in Rome), and Italian Government officials. Napoleon promised to return his troops to France and Italy would not annex the Papal States. At that time, Florence was made the Italian capital.

The agreement was not respected, however, by the republican army leader Garibaldi, who did not accept the government's decision and marched toward Rome. Napoleon thereupon re-installed his troops, and they would stay until the Franco-Prussian War broke out in 1870. The retreat of the French troops on that occasion, which led to the suspension of the First Vatican Council, provided the ideal occasion for Italy to occupy the papal territories. On September 11, 1870, Italian State troops entered the Papal States. First, the papal troops pulled back and defended the city of Rome; but it surrendered on September 20, 1870. Pope Pius IX excommunicated all those who had participated in the taking of Rome (including Vittorio Emanuele); and the former pontifical palaces at the Quirinal now became the residence of the new King of a Unified Italian Kingdom, Vittorio Emanuele. Italy was finally unified and the *Risorgimento* movement had achieved its goal.

---

[58] Jean Guenel, *La dernière guerre du Pape: Les Zouaves pontificaux au secours du Saint Siège 1860–1870* [Histoire] (Rennes, 1998).

[59] The same phrase would be used by the influential French liberal Catholic Montalembert, as the title to his address in front of the Catholic Congres of Malines in 1863, while praising liberal Catholicism in Belgium. The latter speech, which contained positions very similar to those adopted by Vatican II's Declaration *Dignitatis humanae*, was recently re-edited as Charles de Montalembert, *L'église libre dans l'état libre*, ed. Jean-Noël Dumont and Daniel Moulinet [La nuit surveillée] (Paris, 2010).

An unexpected consequence of Italian unification was that Catholics all over Europe sympathized with the pope, who—as was somewhat predicted in the 1859 Napoleonic brochure—had grown enormously in his spiritual power. Finally, the problem was not entirely solved: The pope would not possess the Vatican Hill, but have it "on loan." Nevertheless, the Italian State guaranteed the pope's independence from state rule. A final decision would only be found in 1929, with the Lateran Treaties, as will be pointed out in the next chapter.

Long before that, Pope Pius IX did everything in his power to move against the measures imposed on him by the Italian government. He forbade Italian Catholics from participating in parliamentary elections; and in the decree *Non expedit*[60] in 1868 he expressed the Holy See's refusal to receive Catholic heads of state, unless they refrained from visiting the Italian court. In the tumultuous years of the 1860s, the pope also promulgated encyclicals such as *Quanta cura*[61] (remembered mostly because of its annex, the Syllabus of Errors) and convoked the First Vatican Council. Both doctrinally important events will be understood correctly only against the background of the afore-sketched political and social events.

2.2. *Towards the Third French Republic*

Already in our discussion of the Italian political landscape, we touched briefly on the situation in France. Now we turn to some specifics. In 1848 France too was the scene of revolutionary outbreaks against the restoration of the monarchy. King Louis-Philippe was forced to flee to England. However, unlike the Italian tensions, the French revolt did not turn into an anti-Christian affair. On the contrary, many Catholics had supported the efforts of Louis Napoleon to become president of what would be the Second French Republic. The effort succeeded and a few years after, in 1852, Napoleon III was declared Emperor of France; and he remained so until his defeat in the Franco-Prussian War. Under Napoleon III, French Catholicism was able to regain a good portion of its privileges and had ample freedom to engage in the organization and expansion of Catholic education.

---

[60] The Apostolic Penitentiary issued a decree on February 29, 1868, in which it sanctioned the motto: *'Non expedit,'* indicating it was "not expedient" for Italian Catholics to vote in parliamentary elections.

[61] Pius IX, 'Quanta cura (December 8, 1864),' *Acta Pii Papae IX*, 1:687–700.

Meanwhile, everyday Catholicism during the Second French Empire was characterized by an increasing attention, admiration and sympathy for some local priests, of whom Jean-Marie Vianney[62] remains the most famous. This "Holy priest of Ars" became the stereotype of the anti-intellectual and strongly devotional type of priest, living among his flock of simple parishioners. This type of popular Catholicism was also found in the rise of Marian devotion. In 1846 in the hills above the village of La Salette, two shepherd children had a vision of Mary, which transformed the place into a center for Marian devotion and pilgrimages. Only in 1858 would it be overshadowed by the popularity of Lourdes, when Bernadette Soubirous had a series of visions of the virgin in the caves of Masabielle, near the French Pyrenees. Here too, popular devotion must be seen and understood against the background of Romanticism.

In 1854 Pope Pius IX defined the dogma of Mary's Immaculate Conception, on his own personal initiative. Behind it was a personal reason: Pope Pius IX strongly believed he had been cured of epilepsy, as a result of an intervention of the Virgin Mary. Besides the Marian devotion, devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus was also strongly on the rise during this period. The devotion had been attacked throughout the eighteenth century by Jansenist theologians, but was now strongly spread by the Jesuits and the Redemptorists—both former adversaries of Jansenism and its later followers. The Jesuits dedicated the entire world to the Sacred Heart of Jesus in 1861. This devotion thereby also assumed a political dimension: It stressed the perspective that the eternal stood above the temporal and so continued and supported the tradition which claimed that church power is above state power. In Belgium, the Redemptorist archbishop Auguste-Victor Dechamps dedicated the entire country to the Sacred Heart in 1869. Again in France, the Basilica of the *Sacré coeur* in the Paris Montmartre quarter was built between 1875 and 1914.

With all its Romanticist attention to popular devotion, often based on a romantic view of medieval devotion and church life, France was also the major scene for liturgical developments. The French Benedictine from the Abbey of Solesmes, Dom Prosper Guéranger, was actively promoting

[62] In 1818 Jean-Marie Vianney was appointed parish priest in the small town of Ars, France. On October 3, 1874, Pope Pius IX proclaimed him Venerable. On January 8, 1905, Pope Pius X declared him Blessed and proposed him as a model for parochial priests. In 1925 Pope Pius XI canonized him and designated August 8 as his feast day. On Vianney, see Bernard Nodet, *Le curé d'Ars: Sa pensée, son cœur* (Paris, 1997).

Gregorian chant in the liturgy along with the *Roman missal*.[63] For a long period to come, this abbey would remain influential in Roman Catholic liturgical developments.

Finally, we need to address the topic of the relationship between church and state. Regardless how open Napoleon III had been towards Catholicism, his attitude shifted in the late 1850s, when, during discussions about the *Roman Question*, he sided with the King of Sardinia and his *Risorgimento* plans against the notion of papal temporal power. This created tensions between Catholics and their government, which only disappeared after Napoleon's defeat in 1870.

Increasingly, late nineteenth-century Catholics had developed a strong personal devotion to the pope.[64] After riots in Paris in 1871—during which the Parisian Archbishop Georges Darboy was killed[65]—the parliamentary election resulted in a large, often Catholic, conservative body. The new president of what then became the Third French Republic, Adolphe Thiers, had an open and positive stance toward Catholicism; but he was forced to resign in 1873. He was succeeded in that year by Patrice de Mac-Mâhon, who stayed on until 1879. He supported the conservative forces in the French parliament in their striving towards a restoration of the monarchy. These restorative attempts failed mainly because of internal divided-ness. An unwanted implication, however, was that this failure made French anticlerical tempers fly. In the parliamentary elections

---

[63] The Roman Missal (*Missale Romanum*) is the liturgical book that contains the texts and rubrics for the celebration of Eucharist in the Roman Rite of the Catholic Church. Pope Pius V promulgated, in the Apostolic Constitution *Quo Primum* on July 14, 1570, a previously existing edition of the Roman Missal that was to be used throughout the Latin Church except where a traditional liturgical rite could be proved to be of at least two centuries antiquity. Starting in late seventeenth-century France a number of independent missals were published by bishops influenced by Jansenism and Gallicanism. This situation ended when bishop Pierre-Louis Parisis of Langres and abbot Guéranger initiated their campaign to propose the Roman Missal as the sole valid one. All of this goes to underline that he nineteenth-century situation on the level of liturgy shows a vast variety of rites, see Vincent Petit, *Église et nation: La question liturgique en France au XIX siècle* [Histoire] (Rennes, 2010).

[64] Bruno Horaist, *La dévotion au pape et les catholiques français sous le pontificat de Pie IX, 1846–1878, d'après les archives de la Bibliothèque apostolique vaticane* [Collection de l'École française de Rome 212] (Rome, 1995).

[65] Darboy, former bishop of Nancy and successor to Cardinal François Morlot as the archbishop of Paris in 1863, had been a prominent figure in French Catholicism. He ranked among the main opposers to both the 1864 *Syllabus* and Vatican I's declaration of papal infallibility. See the recent monograph of Jacques-Olivier Boudon, *Monseigneur Darboy, 1813–1877: Archevêque de Paris entre Pie IX et Napoléon III* (Paris, 2011).

of 1876, the anticlerical Republican Party achieved a strong majority of elected members. During the election campaign, historical arguments had played an important role, with republicans accusing the conservatives of wanting to return to the *Ancien Régime* and using the banner: "*Le cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi!*" In 1879, Mac-Mâhon had to resign and was succeeded by Jules Grévy, under whose presidency France would experience an openly anti-Christian regime.

2.3. *The German Confederation*

Founded after the defeat of Napoleon I in Waterloo in 1815 and led by Klemens von Metternich until 1848, the German Confederation united a group of German states. Although in many of these states revolutions occurred in 1848, two years later the Confederation was restored, with ever imminent conflicts between the two leading states of the confederation, the Austrian Empire and the Kingdom of Prussia. In 1866 this would lead to the Austro-Prussian War, and subsequently to the collapse of the Confederation. This led to the split between the Austrian Empire and the North German Confederation, mainly led by Prussia. When in 1871, Napoleon was defeated, Prussian leadership became very influential and sought to unite the North German Confederation with a collection of southern states, with the exception of Austria, resulting finally in the co-existence of the German [Prussian] Empire and the Austrian Empire.

Within the context of the early nineteenth-century German Confederation, the "Cologne Church Struggle" is among the events that cannot remain untouched. This struggle was in fact a quarrel between Protestants and Catholics about the issue of mixed marriages. The ruling class in society—and certainly in the Prussian Kingdom—was Protestant, and upheld a policy supportive of mixed marriages with Catholics, as a means of converting Catholics, often belonging to the minority. This raised serious objections from the side of the Roman Catholic Church, which in turn resulted in the bullying and, in some cases, the outright persecution of Catholic citizens. This policy faltered at the end of the 1840s for political reasons, due to a growing awareness that Catholics too were voters. Politicians came to realize that neglecting them could have serious negative consequences in terms of elections. At the same time, political unrest was growing, only to come to an explosion in 1848, which forced political leaders to focus on other issues.

The relative freedom that Catholics gained in the late 1840s had several effects. To begin with, it resulted in the construction of many new

churches. Also, similar to France, a popular devotion movement was growing strong, with the support and encouragement of the Jesuits. One can mention in this context, for instance, devotion to the Holy Robe at Trier, after the local bishop had made this cloth—believed to have been worn by Jesus—accessible to the wider public. Moreover, the installation of democratic rule and the freedom of organization granted to Catholics after 1848 in the German Confederation led to the establishment of several new monasteries. Catholic unions and associations were established; and, as of 1848, German Catholics began to gather in large groups for the yearly *Katholikentage* (i.e. Catholic days).

In the social welfare field, one of the driving Catholic forces was Adolf Kolping, the so-called *Gesellenvater*, who was particularly concerned about the fate of workers.[66] He initiated Catholic worker unions, which became highly successful. By 1855 there were over a hundred associations and unions in the Prussian areas. The workers's issues were vividly present in the German Confederation, as is clear in the writings of Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx, who had been promoting their ideas since the 1840s. It should be said, however, that many German Catholics were also rapidly engaged in the social issues discussions. For example, the aforementioned Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, gave a series of sermons in 1848 on contemporary social matters. He was well aware of the fact that the church needed to find a Gospel-based solution to cope with the results of the Industrial Revolution, modern liberal capitalism, and its negative effects on the poor. The Catholic social worker movement was strongly supported by Ketteler; and he defended it later on in his writings such as *Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche*,[67] and *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum.*[68] Coming from Rome, at this time, there were no solid solutions offered for contemporary social problems, even after they had been placed on the Vatican Council I agenda. Pope Leo XIII would be the first Pope to publicly address these problems in his 1891 encyclical *Rerum novarum.*[69]

The Catholic social movement had a political face as well. Standing firm against the "threats" of Protestant proselytism (e.g. the Cologne Church

---

[66] Since the 1980s, Kolping's writing are being made public in the Kölner Ausgabe of the *Adolph Kolping-Schriften*, which contains almost twenty volumes of materials, edited by Franz Lüttgen. On Kolping, see Hans Joachim Kracht, *Adolf Kolping: Priester, Pädagoge, Publizist im Dienst christlicher Sozialreform* (Freiburg, 1993).

[67] Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, *Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche* (Mainz, 1862).

[68] Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, *Die Arbeiterfrage und das Christentum* (Mainz, 1864).

[69] Leo XIII, 'Rerum Novarum (May 15, 1891),' *ASS* 23 (1890–1), 641–70.

Struggle) and rising liberalism and capitalism, Catholics in the German Confederation—and mainly in Prussia—bundled forces in the political fraction called *Das Zentrum*. The members of this Catholic Center Party were active in the Prussian parliament, and after having been dissolved briefly in 1867, its formation was restructured and re-established in 1871, with the foundation of the German Empire. The political leadership of the Catholic party was the jurist Ludwig Windthorst,[70] who co-founded it with Ketteler. Windthorst stood in opposition against Otto von Bismarck—who had formerly defeated Austria and France and founded the German Empire—who was in constant conflict with the Roman pontiff.

Bismarck's socio-political struggle with Catholicism in the German Empire is known as the *Kulturkampf*,[71] and took place mainly in the decade of the 1870s. When, during the Franco-Prussian War and at the end of Vatican I, Pope Pius IX refused to give in to a series of demands from Bismarck (e.g. to denounce the Catholic Center Party) the latter declared the pope as his enemy. Politically speaking, Bismarck feared, certainly after the declaration of papal infallibility, that German Catholics would unite on a supranational level with French and Austrian Catholic forces and would endanger the Protestant rule of his empire. In reaction the German leader issued a series of anti-Catholic measures:

- He refused to fire a Catholic teacher who was denying the dogma of infallibility and was canonically no longer allowed to teach.
- On December 10, 1871, he issued the *Kanzelparagraph*, which implied grave sanctions for priests who, during Sunday sermons, dared to speak out on political issues.
- On March 18, 1872, he issued a law pulling all education out of the hands of the religious in an attempt at laicizing education.

---

[70] On Windthorst and his political endeavours, see Hans-Georg Aschoff, *Ludwig Windthorst* [Beiträge zur Katholizismusforschung A: Quellentexte zur Geschichte des Katholizismus 9] (Paderborn, 1991).

[71] By 1871, the Catholic Church comprised 38% of the population of the German Empire. In this newly founded Empire, Otto von Bismarck sought to appeal to liberals and Protestants (61% of the population) by reducing the political and social influence of the Catholic Church. See on the Kulturkampf, for instance, Michael Gross, *The War Against Catholicism: Liberalism and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Ann Arbor, 2004); Massimiliano Valente, *Diplomazia pontificia e Kulturkampf: La Sante Sede e la Prussia tra Pio IX e Bismarck, 1862–1878* [Regione e società 45] (Rome, 2004).

- On July 4, 1872, he issued the *Jesuit Bill*: The Society of Jesus, and later on by extension also other congregations, were prohibited from obtaining property (monasteries and convents) in the German Empire.
- In 1873, he issued a series of *May Acts*: This complex of legislation aimed at putting the church completely under state control. It implied, e.g., that priests had to take state exams in order to be appointed, etc.
- In 1874 and 1875 these laws were expanded even more, and all clergy members were forced to sign an oath of obedience to the law. Upon refusal, their finances were blocked. All non-caritative orders and congregations were suspended.

All of the above generated strong reactions from the *Zentrum* party, from the side of the German bishops, like Paul Ludolf Melchers from Cologne, and from the pope. In some cases, e.g. the bishop of Gniezno-Poznan, Mieczyslaw Halka Ledochowski, priests and bishops were imprisoned as political outlaws. Due to these punishments, after a decade, there were only four Catholic bishops remaining present in the German Empire.

The pope reacted via pastoral letters; and in 1875 he declared that the laws issued by Bismarck were not binding for Roman Catholics. Nevertheless, the actual solution was a political one. The elections of 1873 and 1874 already started proving that the persecution of Catholic citizens had become counterproductive, and *Das Zentrum* was only gaining more voter support. Relationships softened somewhat but only really changed under Pope Leo XIII. In his struggle against socialism, Bismarck would eventually co-operate with Catholics rather than oppose them.[72]

2.4. *American Catholicism under Pius IX*

Due to the enormous growth of the Catholic Church in the United States (from 700 priests in 1846 to 6,000 in 1878) during the papacy of Pope Pius IX and in light of the pope's apparently liberal and progressive outlook in the early years of his papacy, the United States established diplomatic relations with the Papal States on 7 April 1848. This lasted until 1867 when a different kind of pope had begun to be perceived and U.S. domestic pressures forced a closing of relations. Nevertheless, an objective observer would have to acknowledge that Pius IX greatly contributed to the ecclesi-

[72] Ronald J. Ross, *The Failure of Bismarck's Kulturkampf: Catholicism and State Power in Imperial Germany 1871–1887* (Washington DC, 2000).

astical structure of the Catholic Church in the United States.[73] He created some twenty new dioceses in the United States and supported American bishops in their desire to hold diocesan synods.

During the Civil War that tore apart the nation during the first half of the 1860s Catholics in the United States (i.e. the "North") resonated around the Archbishop of New York, while Catholics in the Confederate States (i.e. the "South") resonated around the Archbishop of New Orleans. When President Abraham Lincoln asked Pope Pius to elevate John McCloskey, the Archbishop of New York, into the college of cardinals, Pope Pius refused. Throughout the Civil War, much to the dismay of President Lincoln, Pope Pius IX corresponded with the Confederate leader Jefferson Davis, addressing Davis as the President of the Confederate States of America. Shortly after the Civil War, Confederate General Robert E. Lee remarked that Pope Pius IX was the only sovereign in Europe who had recognized the Confederacy as a legitimate country.[74]

3. *Catholic Theological Currents on the Eve of Vatican I*

After this broad description, one needs to focus more attention on changes and events occurring within the church, although it remains clear that these cannot be separated from the socio-political developments. In this section, we will first devote some attention to the rise of ultramontanism. Next, we will give attention to the role of scholasticism, and third mention some of the main documents promulgated by Pope Pius IX. All three will be important to comprehend the theological evolutions under his pontificate.

Etymologically, the word ultramontanism is derived from the Latin clause *ultra montes* (over the mountains, i.e. the Alps) and refers to Rome. In general, the term describes a climate of thought that revived in the second half of the nineteenth century and in particular during the French Third Republic. The movement comes both from below and from the top of the Catholic hierarchy. On the level of basic Catholicism, ultramontanism is strongly linked with the aftermath of the series of European revolutions and the growth of new, modern nation states in the nineteenth

[73] See James Hennessy, *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States* (New York, 1981).

[74] For background, see *Jefferson Davis: Private letters, 1823–1889*, ed. Hudson Strode (New York, 1967).

century, which caused a sense of insecurity and a longing for the restoration of the old bond between church and state. In this general atmosphere, the seemingly unshakable attitude of Pope Pius IX made him a solid and secure point of reference for Roman Catholics.

On the other hand, the pope himself underlined his central role in the church and thereby positioned the Holy See as the sole center of Catholic truth and morals. The movement was enhanced on both levels and therefore could spread rapidly and widely. In general terms, ultramontanism[75] can be described in five points:

- The church's self-perception is that of an ultimately independent and self-bound entity: It is tied to nothing and no one, yet claims, on the other hand, that everything and everyone is tied to the church.
- This has implications for the church's attitude about civil powers: the church's leadership stresses not only its own independence in relationship to modern nation states, but also its supremacy. The church has its power by divine right; and, therefore, the church holds a higher power than state authorities.
- As a logical consequence, citizens and civil powers, if they wish to obey God's will, are required primordially to obey ecclesiastical powers.
- This attitude is linked with other centralizing efforts. For instance, the claim that all science—and in particular philosophy and theology—should orient itself toward the church and its magisterium.
- Finally, this results in the shaping of the church's own particular thought framework, represented by neo-scholasticism.

In terms of church-state relationships, the Catholic Church develops the theory of thesis-hypothesis. This theoretic model argues as follows: In an ideal world (*thesis*) Catholicism is the only and true religion, followed by all and promoted and defended by civil authorities. But, given the fact that reality is often different (*hypothesis*), the church does not accept, but (formally) tolerates the existence of other Christian and non-Christian religions. It demands of the state however, that it promotes and strives toward the spreading of Catholicism, to the benefit of all.

Before dealing with some of the major documents illustrating the attitude of Pope Pius IX and discussing Vatican I, we wish to expand on

---

[75] Cf. Austin Gough, *Paris and Rome: The Gallican Church and the Ultramontane Campaign 1848–1853* (Oxford, 1986).

the last element of ultramontanism: neo-scholasticism. In the history of philosophy and theology, scholasticism stands for an important current, to be situated in medieval times.[76] The recourse to medieval systems of theological argumentation is, in itself, typical of the Romanticist era. In the Middle Ages, scholasticism was characterized strongly by the development of a new paradigm of thought and argumentation.[77] Certainly after the foundation of the first universities in the period of high scholasticism, theologians sought to integrate Aristotelian philosophical argumentation with Christian doctrine. Theologians such as Thomas Aquinas had a crucial influence at this juncture. A rational and logical structure of argumentation, based on the philosophy of Aristotle, was henceforth picked up in theological discourse. This had important significance for religious epistemology: truth claims were henceforth made dependent on correct and valid speculative argumentation.

In the middle of the nineteenth century, in reaction to rationalism and semi-rationalism, theology was in search of an appropriate Christian thought system; and thinkers such as Johann Baptist Franzelin[78] and Joseph Wilhelm Karl Kleutgen proposed a return to scholastic reasoning, yet now in the context of a Post Enlightenment modern Catholicism. Kleutgen published his two major contributions to Catholic theology between 1853 and 1863, respectively entitled *Die Theologie der Vorzeit*[79] and *Die Philosophie der Vorzeit.*[80] This theological-philosophical groundwork attempted to develop a pre-idealist philosophy, imbedded in a Christian religious atmosphere that distanced itself from any modern rationalist tendency, while embracing aristotelic reasoning. Almost inevitably, both Franzelin and Kleutgen became active opponents of the theological projects by Günther and Frohschammer.[81]

---

[76] Ulrich G. Leinsle, *Einführung in die scholastische Theologie* [UTB für Wissenschaft—Uni-Taschenbücher 1865] (Paderborn, 1995).

[77] Medieval scholasticism itself had various phases, including early or pre-scholasticism (ninth to twelfth century); high scholasticism (twelfth to thirteenth century); late scholasticism (fourteenth to fifteenth century); and finally baroque scholasticism (sixteenth century). Cf. Fergus Kerr, *After Aquinas: Versions of Thomism* (Malden, 2002).

[78] Peter Walter, *Johann Baptist Franzelin, 1816–1886, Jesuit, Theologe, Kardinal: Ein Lebensbild* (Bozen, 1987).

[79] Joseph Wilhelm Karl Kleutgen, *Die Theologie der Vorzeit*, (3 Vols., Münster, 1853–60, 5 Vols., 1867–74).

[80] Joseph Wilhelm Karl Kleutgen, *Die Philosophie der Vorzeit* (2 Vols., Münster, 1860–3; Innsbruck, 1878).

[81] Elke Pahud de Moranges, *Philosophie und kirchliche Autorität: Der Fall Jakob Frohschammer vor der römischen Indexkongregation* [Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 4] (Paderborn, 2005); Theo Schäfer, *Die erkenntnistheoretische Kontroverse*

The Post Enlightenment context led these theologians into developing a scholastic system of speculative reasoning, which was quite different from the medieval one and is known as neo-scholasticism. The importance and influence of neo-scholasticism and its support from the Roman Catholic hierarchy was strongly felt on several levels. For a long period the works of Kleutgen and Franzelin would become the main philosophical-theological literature in Catholic educational institutions, especially seminaries, and as a result generations of Catholic clergy were raised and trained within this framework. On various levels, this current was supported by the hierarchy. In 1850, initiated by the Holy See, the periodical *La Civiltà Cattolica* was founded in Rome, as an organ for promoting neo-scholasticism and countering liberalism. The periodical was always censored by the Vatican, even though it was placed under the editorship of the Society of Jesus. Next, followed a series of condemnations of theologians wanting or even attempting to incorporate Enlightenment thinking. Condemnations followed, for instance, of Bonnetty (1855), Günther (1857), Frohschammer (1862) and Ubaghs (1866)—a Louvain tradionalist much under the influence of Bautain.[82]

The latter list of condemnations reveals another element: The overall attitude of the Catholic hierarchy about the contemporary intertwining of religious and political developments was striking. After 1848, Pius IX adopted the literary style and approach that had been proposed by Pope Gregory XVI in *Mirari vos*. This entailed a generally negative appreciation for anything that presented itself as new, a refusal to adapt church and theology to the modern context, and an overall hostile and defensive rhetoric.

This attitude is illustrated by two of the most significant documents from Pope Pius IX's pontificate, promulgated in 1864: the encyclical *Quanta cura*,[83] and the *Syllabus errorum*.[84] The *Syllabus*, significantly promulgated on the feast of Mary Immaculate, consisted of a collection of paraphrases and citations from earlier papal documents and references

---

Kleutgen-Günther: Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Neuscholastik (Paderborn, 1961).

[82] On Ubaghs, see Johan Ickx, *La Santa Sede tra Lamennais e San Tommaso d'Aquino: La condanna di Gerard Casimir Ubaghs e della dottrina dell'Università Cattolica di Lovanio, 1834–1870* [Collectanea Archivi Vaticani 56] (Vatican, 2005). For the nineteenth-century Louvain school of theology, see the book by Leo Kenis, *De Theologische Faculteit te Leuven in de negentiende eeuw, 1834–1889* (Brussels, 1992).

[83] Pius IX, 'Quanta cura (December 8, 1864),' *Acta Pii Papae IX*, 1:687–700.

[84] Pius IX, 'Syllabus errorum (December 8, 1864),' *Acta Pii Papae IX*, 1:701–17.

to the Index of Prohibited Books. The abovementioned condemnations of (semi-)rationalist theologies were all recaptured by the document. As a whole, it constituted a complement to *Quanta cura*, in which the general attitude of the pope was proclaimed. For a good understanding of the document, it should be mentioned that it too did not just fall out of the sky, but was very well prepared. The idea of a syllabus itself had already been present some years before. It had been proposed by Vincenzo Gioacchino Pecci already in 1849 during the Synod of Bishops of Umbria (held at Spoleto). Thirty years later, Pecci would be known to the world as Pope Leo XIII.

Other bishops too had sent reports to Rome, asking for a series of propositions to be officially condemned. For instance, Frenchmen such as Louis-Édouard Pie, Bishop of Poitiers; and the aforementioned Benedictine of Solesmes, Dom Prosper Guéranger. From the Belgian side, the Louvain University rector Pierre-François-Xavier De Ram had also sent in a list, supported by members of a theology faculty that had become an ultramontanist stronghold after the re-foundation of the Louvain University (it had been closed as a result of the French Revolution). The background here also lies with the fact that the new openness towards Catholicism in France had made intra-church tensions arise between liberals such as Montalembert and Dupanloup, and anti-liberal Catholics, such as Louis-Édouard Pie and Louis Veuillot. The syllabus sought to respond to all of this.

The document itself consisted of a list of 80 propositions, each of them condemned by the magisterium of the Catholic Church.[85] It harkened back, partially, to some condemnations already put forward in Pius IX's encyclical *Qui pluribus*,[86] of November 9, 1846—an encyclical from the early years of the pontificate, drafted by Cardinal Lambruschini, Gregory XVI's Secretary of State, which dealt with the dangers of sectarianism, rationalism, and the rise of "biblical societies." For the most part it can be read as an authoritative reaction both to the incorporation of an Enlightenment rationale in theology, and to the political turmoil that shaped

[85] The Syllabus cited a number of previous documents that had been written during Pius's papacy. These include: *Qui pluribus, Maxima quidem, Singulari quadam, Tuas libenter, Multiplices inter, Quanto conficiamur, Noscitis, Nostis et nobiscum, Meminit unusquisque, Ad Apostolicae, Nunquam fore, Incredibili, Acerbissimum, Singularis nobisque, Multis gravibusque, Quibus quantisque, Quibus luctuosissimis, In consistoriali, Cum non sine, Cum saepe, Quanto conficiamur, Jamdudum cernimus, Novos et ante, Quibusque vestrum* and *Cum catholica.*

[86] Pius IX, 'Qui pluribus (November 9, 1846),' *Acta Pii Papae IX*, 1:4–24.

the *Pio Nono* pontificate. The Syllabus of errors consists of eight larger sections,[87] dealing with the following problems:

- Pantheism, naturalism, and absolute rationalism (propositions 1–7)
- Semi-rationalism (propositions 8–14)
- Indifferentism and latitudinarianism, communism, socialism, etc. (propositions 15–18)
- The position of the church and its rights: the defense of temporal power for the Roman Pontiff (propositions 19–38)
- Civil society and its relationship to the church: thesis-hypothesis (propositions 39–55)
- Natural and christian ethics and christian marriage (propositions 56–74)
- The civil power of the Roman pontiff in the Papal States (propositions 75–76)
- Modern liberalism (propositions 77–80)

More than often, the reactions to these papal documents were negative. Some national governments, such as those from Russia, France and Italy prohibited the publication of the *Syllabus*. Theologians such as Döllinger and Montalembert openly reacted against it. All the while, the *Syllabus of errors* and *Quanta cura* also provide the necessary background against which the major event of the pontificate of Pius IX is to be read: the First Vatican Council. Although the council would officially open on December 8, 1869, the idea of its convocation was first laid out to members of the Roman curia on December 6, 1864: two days before the promulgation of *Quanta cura*, and the *Syllabus of errors*. The pope imposed silence on all the cardinals with regard to the future council. In what follows, we wish to conclude our survey of Pope Pius IX's pontificate with an overview of Vatican I.

4. *The First Vatican Council 1869–70*

Having noted the strong connection between the 1864 documents and the convocation of an ecumenical council, we will now focus more precisely on this important event. We will deal with it at considerable length, and attempt to make clear that this council—as any council—cannot be

[87] See E.E.Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (New York, 1958).

understood properly without taking into account the background we have sketched above. In fact, the notion of *aggiornamento* would almost unequivocally fit the church's tradition of gathering councils, since this tradition involves its ongoing commitment to challenge the needs of the times. To this extent, Vatican I is no stranger, and is called precisely to address the effects of modernity. In what follows, our attention will be devoted both to procedural and practical elements, and to the content of the conciliar debate and its outcome, as well as to a list of projects that never finally reached the status of a conciliar decree and are therefore often neglected by theologians and church historians.

4.1. *Preparations and Procedure*

In the period after 1864, Pope Pius IX consulted with several cardinals and with both a list of Latin rite bishops (36 bishops, among them no less than nine Frenchmen, indicating the importance of the church of France during this pontificate) and a few Oriental rite bishops,[88] in view of determining the precise agenda of the council. Soon, a list of issues was made up, containing subjects like pantheism, religious indifferentism, rationalism, socialism, etc. In this period, the pope established a small commission of cardinals, responsible for the organization of the council. These are important steps, because former councils did not always have clear regulations or procedures. They were often prepared ad hoc, and in the case of the Council of Trent, the official regulations had only been completed and published after the council. Now, Pius IX would develop a clear structure with council regulations—completed by the end of 1868—which would partially enter canon law in the 1917 Code of Canon Law[89] and would constitute the basis for the Second Vatican Council's *regolamento*.

Structure was much needed, for the church had developed; and the current council would be an altogether different council in comparison to

[88] The position of the so-called uniate bishops at Vatican I is a complex issue in itself, since considerable tensions rose due to repeated attempts from the side of Roman instances to latinise the Greek-Catholic Churches. See Constantin G. Patelos, *La politique de latinisation au sein de la commission préparatoire de Vatican I* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1969). All the while, Pius IX was the first pope in centuries to devote serious attention to the Greek Catholic patriarchates as well as to the orthodox churches by creating an "oriental" section within the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* in January 1862. Cf. Roger Aubert, *Le pontificat de Pie IX*, pp. 415–6; Étienne Fouilloux, *Les catholiques et l'unité chrétienne du XIX au XX siècle: Itinéraires européens d'expression française* (Paris, 1982).

[89] *Codex iuris canonici Pii X Pontificis Maximi iussu digestus Benedicti Papae XV auctoritate promulgatus* (Vatican City, 1917); For an English version, see *The 1917 Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law*, trans. and ed. Edward N. Peters (San Francisco, 2001).

that of Trent. After three centuries of developments from the Tridentine era onward, the structure and practices of the church itself had changed. This is already evident from the change in the number of bishops. Trent had opened with about 25 bishops. The First Vatican Council would gather about eight hundred of them, requiring a different organizational structure right from the outset.[90] This number would be tripled yet by the opening of Vatican II in 1962. The City of Rome was chosen by the pope for several reasons: against the background of the *Roman Question*, it was crucial to underline Rome as the capital of Latin Christianity and to underline the pope's central position, as well as his right to have a worldly territory to rule. At the time of the council's opening, the city was still entirely his territory; and he still resided at the Quirinal Palace. In this sense, the very gathering of the council proved at the same time to be a political and a theological act, and it sought to underline and support ultramontanist sentiments.

Also, very practically, a congregation hall was needed to gather hundreds of bishops. For such a large assembly, the basilica of Saint Peter's proved most fit. The daily council gatherings would be held in the right transept of the basilica with the pope presiding. No microphones existed, so bishops holding council interventions were required to speak out loudly (they had to cover a distance of about eighty meters), and anything that was said, was noted by the stenographs. So much for the actual council congregations, let us now return to the preparations.

For organizational purposes, Pope Pius IX established his Central Directive Commission, consisting of Cardinals Costantino Patrizi, Karl-August von Reisach, Antonio Maria Panebianco, Giuseppe Andrea Bizzarri and Prospero Caterini. Only one of them was not Italian. The commission met on various occasions: first in March 1865, then July 1867, and later several times in 1868. This commission, led by the pope and council secretary Monsignor Pietro Gianelli, created five specialized commissions: a Dogmatic Commission, a Commission on Discipline, a Commission on the Religious, a Commission on the Oriental Churches and the Missions, and a Politico-ecclesiastical Commission.[91]

The regulations, officially dubbed the *Ordo celebrandi concilii* drafted by this Central Commission provided that the respective pre-conciliar

[90] For a survey of Vatican I council attendants, see Honoré Fisquet, *Biographies, portraits et autographes des pères du concile premier du Vatican* (Paris, 1889).

[91] Cf. Klaus Schatz, *Vaticanum I, 1869–1870*. Bd. 1: *Vor der Eröffnung* (Paderborn, 1992).

commissions were made up of cardinals and bishops as members, and theological consulters. Quite different from the Council of Trent, the role of theologians became less evident here. At Trent, separate commissions of theologians were foreseen, which held their own conciliar gatherings and were taken seriously by the bishops. Now, the role of the theologians was downtuned to that of mere consulters; and they had no voting or other rights. They could speak out only when asked to do so. The assignment for these pre-conciliar commissions was to prepare draft texts on a number of subjects. A text prepared on a certain subject would then go to the council fathers for debate during the general congregations. These were held for three to four days a week; and in order to offer council interventions, the council fathers had to previously register themselves with the secretariat of the council. Initially, the council regulations for Vatican I did not foresee time restrictions for interventions; but, by February of 1870, so many complaints were filed, that the regulations were revised. In the new version, approved on February 22, the following demands would be inserted:

- Remarks and criticism can be made, but should also offer constructive elements
- The debate will be led by the council presidency (a board of cardinals), and will be better conducted, to have it go more orderly
- After a period of reactions, all would be gathered and sent to the commissions, who are obliged to keep them in mind when revising the text
- Repetitions of arguments already expressed are to be avoided
- At the end of a period of debate, a general vote is to be organized

The latter vote was crucial. Three options for voting were available: *placet* (accepted); *non placet* (rejected); *placet iuxta modum* (accepted under condition of revision). When a two-third majority of *placet*-votes is reached, the text is finalized and promulgated as a conciliar decree. However, most of the time, a text did not reach such a degree of unanimous agreement from the start; and when such a majority was not reached, the text was sent back to the respective commission responsible for it, for revision along the lines of the remarks and interventions by the council fathers. Thereupon, the entire procedure began anew: the text was again presented before the council fathers; and discussion could start once more.

In the period before the council then, the commissions were actively drafting the so-called *schema*s. An entire collection of them would be

prepared; but in the end only two official council documents would be promulgated: *Pastor aeternus*[92] and *Dei filius.*[93] For this reason, we will mainly focus here on the work of the pre-conciliar Doctrinal Commission; and we use this as a starting point to address the actual conciliar events, which concerned mainly these two schemas.

The Doctrinal Commission, led by Cardinal Luigi Bilio, gathered a theological brain trust with theologians from the Roman School,[94] such as Perrone, Franzelin, and Klemens Schrader, and, once again, Pecci. It was quickly made clear that the basis for their theological work would lie with the 1864 *Syllabus of errors*. In fact, the *Syllabus* was split up in different parts, and groups of members were assigned to write chapters, departing from these parts. Already in this period two main issues were debated: (1) the question of papal infallibility and the role of the Roman Pontiff within the structure of the Catholic Church and in his relationship to the outside world; and (2) the issues of modern thinking and its compatibility with Catholic doctrine. In that sense, the commission took for granted the indications of the pope that the council address two central issues: On the one hand, questions should be tackled regarding of the existence and nature of knowledge of God, as well as the nature of revelation; this refers back to the rise of rationalism and all new attempts at reconciling Enlightenment notions with Christian thinking. The second theme involved the issue of church reform; a Roman Catholic reaction was required to all the aforementioned revolutions, and the *Roman Question* was at the heart of the debate.

Before entering into a description of the redaction history of the two conciliar constitutions, we need to point to one more fact. Before the

---

92 Pope Pius IX, *Pastor aeternus*. The dogmatic constitution on the Church of Christ, was issued by the First Vatican Council on July 18, 1870. The document defined the apostolic primacy conferred on Peter, the perpetuity of the petrine primacy in the Roman pontiffs, the meaning and power of the papal primacy, and Papal infallibility—infallible teaching authority (magisterium) of the pope.

93 Pope Pius IX, *Dei filius*. The dogmatic constitution on the Catholic faith, was adopted unanimously and issued on April 24, 1870. While its draft, presented to the Council on March 8, drew no serious criticism, a group of 35 English-speaking bishops did fear that the first chapter's opening phrase, "Sancta romana catholica ecclesia" (the holy Roman Catholic Church), might be interpreted as supporting the Anglican "Branch Theory" and later succeeded in having an additional adjective inserted, so that the final text read: "Sancta catholica apostolica romana ecclesia" (the holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church).

94 See the new edition of Walter Kasper's *Die Lehre von der Tradition in der römische Schule: Giovanni Perrone, Carlo Passaglia, Clemens Schrader* [Gesammelte Schriften 1] (Freiburg, 2011).

council opened in December 1869, Pius IX had made attempts to invite both the Orthodox Churches and the Reformed communities to send representatives to the Council. This however, was carried out in an atmosphere of Roman Catholicism's claiming to be the only true religion and inviting members from other churches to "return" to the mother church. These attempts failed to be successful.

4.2. *Dei filius and Pastor aeternus*

Officially, the council would be summoned by Pope Pius IX on June 29 of the year 1868, and the preparations would carry on, until the council was solemnly opened on December 8, 1869, precisely on the fifth anniversary of *Quanta cura*.[95] After the council's solemn opening, one of the first practical affairs to be arranged was the election of new commission members. The pre-conciliar commissions were officially dismantled; and among the council fathers elections were held for new members in the five commissions, now "conciliar commissions." The results were made public in the following order: The Doctrinal Commission's composition became clear on December 20, 1869; that of the Commission on Discipline on December 28, 1869; of the Commission on the Religious, on January 3, 1870; and ultimately the Oriental Commission, on January 19, 1870.

Let us then, having outlined the general procedure, turn to the particular history of the drafts of *Dei filius* and *Pastor aeternus*. A first schema for what would become *Dei filius* was developed by the pre-conciliar commission and was made up of no less than eighteen chapters. This text, chiefly written by Franzelin, was presented to the council fathers on December 10, 1869,[96] and at first consisted of a large treatise defending a neo-scholastic perspective on Catholic theology and adopting several of the positions taken by the *Syllabus errorum*. The apologetic nature of the document becomes clear immediately when surveying its chapters:

---

[95] For more background and information on Vatican I, see Christophe Paul, *Le concile Vatican I* (Paris, 2000).

[96] Klaus Schatz, *Vaticanum I, 1869–1870*. Bd. 2: *Von der Eröffnung bis zur Konstitution Dei Filius* (Paderborn, 1993). Also see on the preparations of *Dei filius*, the work of Hermann Josef Pottmeyer, *Der Glaube vor dem Anspruch der Wissenschaft: Die Konstitution über den katholischen Glauben Dei Filius des ersten Vatikanischen Konzils und die unveröffentlichten theologischen Voten der vorbereitenden Kommission* (Freiburg, 1968), pp. 95–105.

1. Condemnation of materialism and pantheism (Schelling)
2. Condemnation of rationalism and semi-rationalism
3. Confirmation of Scripture and Tradition as the unique sources of revelation
4. Confirmation of the necessity of supernatural revelation
5. Confirmation of the mysteries of faith as being divinely revealed
6. Stress of the distinction between divine faith and human science
7. Necessity of motives of credibility of revelation
8. The supernatural virtue of Catholic faith
9. The act of faith as a supernatural act
10. The relationship between divine faith and human science
11. The immutability of dogmas held by the Catholic Church
12. The unity of the divine nature
13. Liberty of God's actions in creation
14. Christological principles
15. Common origin of humankind
16. On the supernatural order and the primitive state of man created
17. On original sin
18. On the supernatural grace offered by Christ as sole redeemer

On top of these chapters, the schema counted some 43 notes, explaining the risks inherent to any denial of the priority of the supernatural order. Thus, the draft recaptured a list of previous condemnations, and as a whole can be seen as a neo-scholastic attempt to block the Enlightenment rationale entering Catholic theology.[97] When bearing in mind the theological developments of the past decades, it is not hard to imagine that this met with quite some negative reactions from the side of the council fathers. Many thought the "Schema on the Catholic Faith" was being too "manualistic" (along the lines of seminary manuals from the hand of Franzelin, who had been the main architect of the text, together with the aforementioned Pecci) and too defensive. Rather, some bishops claimed, a return should be made to the Tridentine procedures and language, whereby it became clear that between Trent and Vatican I, many perceived a tension. As a result of the conciliar debate, a revision commission went to work, to redraft the entire schema. Although Franzelin strongly defended his work, a new version was presented in which only

[97] Cf. Roger Aubert, *La constitution "Dei Filius" du concile du Vatican*, in *De Doctrina Concilii Vaticani Primi* (Vatican City, 1969), pp. 46–121.

the first part of the Franzelin tractate was maintained. This reduction, largely carried out by Kleutgen, resulted in a second, and intermediary version, now numbering nine chapters:[98]

1. On God and creation
2. On revelation
3. On faith
4. On the relationship between faith and science
5. On the trinity
6. On the creation of man
7. On man's elevation and fall
8. On the word incarnate
9. On the grace of Christ

A creative solution, to safeguard many of the condemnations present in the former text, was to transfer them to the annexes of the document. These annexes were the so-called canons, by which the First Vatican Council upheld the ancient tradition of adding a series of short propositions to each council text, complementing and explaining it, and for the most part denouncing errors. Precisely these canons, in an abbreviated formula, maintained much of the old Franzelin text. Yet again, the schema was judged too elaborate and was revised another time, only to end up with a constitution of four chapters, which was acceptable to most of the fathers. The dogmatic constitution *On the Catholic Faith*, would finally be approved and promulgated on April 24, 1870, and contained indeed just four chapters, and a preface.[99]

With these four chapters, the Catholic Church sought to define its own position over against the Enlightenment for decades to come, and in that sense, *Dei filius* is a crucial document for understanding the evolution of late nineteenth-century and twentieth-century theology. While in its first chapter, entitled "On God, the creator of all things," the purpose was mainly a confession of Faith, safeguarding the classic doctrines and God's freedom as creator—over against Günther's claims on the necessity of

[98] Joannes Dominicus Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum: Nova et Amplissima Collectio* (Graz, 1960–1), 53:164–77.

[99] The preface to the constitution is not, as such, part of conciliar doctrine. See Jared Wicks, *Doing Theology* (New York, 2009), p. 266: "The Preface was not discussed by the bishops of Vatican I as they reviewed and amended the preliminary drafts of the constitution, but it was added by the Council leadership, with the approval of Pope Pius IX, to express how the Council understood its place in history."

creation. This provides the broad horizon for the next chapters, in which the legacy of modernity, and in particular the issue of faith and reason is treated. It also engages in the debate on the nature of man, stressing, in line with the Fourth Lateran Council, the fact that the human creation is composed of both spirit and body. Against this backdrop, chapter two "On revelation," stretches further. Relying strongly on a passus that appeared both in the Franzelin and Kleutgen schema, it contains the famous proposition, claiming that our "Holy Mother Church holds and teaches that God, the beginning and end of all things, can be known with certitude by the natural light of human reason from created things." The expression is chosen with the utmost care, and avoids extremes as defended by Bautain and Günther in decades earlier, while recognizing the fact that the God creator presented in the Scriptures is knowable by man's light of reason, even in his fallen state. This counters fideist position, yet at the same time the constitution shies away from shere rationalist approaches to the knowledge of God. Therefore, the chapter also stresses that God has another, supernatural way of revealing himself. At this juncture the Council stresses the importance of faith, through which, unlike reason, God's revelation can be known fully, and believers attain a "firm certitude" that is free of error. The third chapter, "On faith," then goes on to refine the notion of the Catholic act of faith, in what, again, is a dense and complex phrasing, describing faith as "a supernatural virtue by which we, with the aid and inspiration of the grace of God, believe that the things revealed by Him are true, not because the intrinsic truth of the revealed things has been perceived by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God Himself who reveals them, who can neither deceive nor be deceived." Among the reasons for this definition, ranks the conviction that faith and reason are not to be split up in a dualistic manner, rendering human reason independent from faith. On the contrary, both are tied together, and the assent of faith is not regarded as a blind movement of the intellect. Again, the next and last chapter, "On faith and reason," refines the delicate bond of both divine faith and the light of reason, claiming that "right reasoning demonstrates the basis of faith and, illumined by its light, perfects the knowledge of divine things, while faith frees and protects reason from errors and provides it with manifold knowledge." The council had thus developed an official Catholic stance on what had become the key theological crux in modernity.

In the mean time, on January 21, another pre-conciliar schema had been distributed among the council fathers, that now requires our attention. The second main Vatican I agenda item was the organization of

the church both theologically and structurally. That would ultimately be presented in the council's dogmatic constitution on the church of Christ, *Pastor aeternus*.[100] The schema distributed in January 1870 was designed within the Doctrinal Commission, with the purpose of complementing the draft on the Catholic faith. Both texts were to be seen as a diptych, presenting the church's positions on the most debated issues at the end of the nineteenth century. Yet, here too the redaction history will only provide a good understanding of the final draft. The text presented to the council fathers—after a liturgy in the Maronite rite—will be an important first step toward a document that has ever since been debated by theologians and non-theologians alike. The "Schema on the Church" consisted of fifteen chapters, and fifteen additional canons. Here too, the chapter titles are revealing in themselves:

1. The church is the mystical body of Christ
2. Christian religion can only be lived in and through the church founded by Christ
3. The church is a true, perfect, and spiritual society
4. The church is a visible society
5. On the visible unity of the church
6. The church is necessary to obtain salvation (*sine ecclesia nulla salus*)
7. Outside of the church no salvation (*extra ecclesia nulla salus*)
8. The church is indefectible
9. The church is infallible
10. On the powers of the church
11. On papal primacy
12. On the temporal domain of the Holy See
13. The relationship between church and state
14. On the rights and exercise of civil power according to the doctrines of the church
15. On particular rights of the church in its relationship to the civil powers

Much similar to the former text discussed, this draft echoed the voices of the "Roman School" of theology, with a clear influence of Schrader, Perrone, and also of Franzelin, certainly on the three closing chapters of the document. It is clear from the survey of the chapters alone that the

[100] One of the best reconstructions of the debate is found in the book of Roger Aubert, *Vatican I* (Paris, 1964).

schema reflected a reaction against the events of the past quarter century, and in this sense was highly contextual. Before we look at the schema's reception by the council fathers, it might prove worthwhile to study its background in more detail.

In fact, the schema featured a broad picture of the church as a whole, its theological foundations, its attitude toward civil authorities, etc. This in itself is noteworthy: the text was not at all limited to the topic of papal powers, but situated the latter within the broader context of a Catholic ecclesiology.[101] In fact, the schema had already been the result of a discussion going on in the pre-conciliar period. Already in February 1869, the Jesuit periodical *La Civiltà cattolica* had published an article demanding to put the issue of infallibility high on the conciliar agenda, and by the end of the same year a *Pro-memoria* on the church in general had been prepared for Pius IX. Strikingly, the latter document did not at all discuss the role of the Roman Pontiff. At the same time a pre-conciliar *Schema de romano pontifice* circulated, consisting of three parts: The institution of the papacy, its perpetual character, and the nature of papal primacy.

Both would be integrated, to the extent that the issue of primacy was integrated in the schema laid out before the council fathers. It is important to stress here that initially, the notion of "infallibility" was reserved for the church as a whole, after which papal primacy was discussed as a particular exercise of the church's infallible nature.[102] However, given the effect of ultramontanism, and the still unresolved *Roman Question*, the "Schema on the Church" became hotly debated, even before it was officially on the council's agenda. This officious debate throughout February and March of 1870 soon gave rise to an internal dividedness at the council, and to the organization of petitions circling around about the necessity of a definition of papal infallibility.

A petition in favor of putting papal infallibility on the agenda, supported by some Belgian bishops such as Dechamps,[103] the French Bishop Louis-Édouard Pie, the English Cardinal Henry Edward Manning, and others, obtained about 400 signatures. Counter to that, another petition circulated, finally sub-signed by some 136 council fathers. As a result of this turmoil, the Doctrinal Commission organized a vote on the entire issue;

---

101 Georges Dejaifve, *Pape et évêques au premier Concile du Vatican* (Bruges, 1961).

102 Cf. Richard Costigan, *Vatican I and Infallibility: The Consensus of the Church and Papal Infallibility: A Study in the Background of Vatican I* (Washington DC, 2005).

103 Françoise Belpaire, *Vatican I: Les évêques belges et la question de l'infaillibilité pontificale, 1865–1873* (Louvain, 1970).

and it decided in favor of a more elaborate and precise section on papal infallibility. As a consequence, a document was spread containing a text to be added to chapter eleven of the "Schema on the Church." This only threw oil on the fire, and the issue was now in the open, with bishops intervening pro and con a papal infallibility definition, during the debate on other schemata . . . Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans openly rejected the doctrine and was followed by a good deal of the French and mainly German bishops.[104] Again, on April 27, two days after the promulgation of *Dei filius*, the Doctrinal Commission gathered and discussed the many written interventions of council fathers already filed. Two questions were put forward there, inspired by the aforementioned Schema on the Roman Pontiff's structure. First: Should chapter eleven be turned into a separate constitution on the Roman Pontiff? And second, if so, is it acceptable to do so in four chapters, entitled: The Institution of Papal Primacy; The Perpetuity of Papal Primacy; The Nature of Papal Primacy; Papal Infallibility.

The vote was answered positively on all accounts by a majority. As a consequence, a new schema was drafted according to this fourfold structure. No longer was the role and function of the Roman Pontiff situated within its broader ecclesiastical context, with attention to the role of his fellow bishops. Due to the *Roman Question*, and as a result of the wide spread of ultramontanist and centralist ideas fully supported by the Catholic hierarchy, a new constitution was drafted. Or better: chapter eleven was detached from the "Schema on the Church"—which would never again become the object of conciliar debate as a result of (once more) political events—and was turned into a fourfold constitution on the Roman Pontiff as the center of the church's unity, stressing both his juridical and dogmatic power. The structure of the new schema, completed on May 2, 1870, is the following:

- On the institution of the apostolic primacy in Blessed Peter
- On the permanence of the primacy of Blessed Peter in the Roman Pontiff
- On the power and character of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff
- On the infallible teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff

[104] For more background see Margaret O'Gara, *Triumph in Defeat: Infallibility, Vatican I and the French Minority Bishops* (Washington DC, 1988).

The fourth chapter constituted a novelty over against the initial schemata constituting the background of this text (both the "Schema on the Church" and the one "On the Roman Pontiff"), and contained the following central passage, defining the dogma of papal infallibility. We reproduce the passage here:

> [...] we teach and define as a divinely revealed dogma that when the Roman pontiff speaks ex cathedra, that is, when, in the exercise of his office as shepherd and teacher of all Christians, in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the whole church, he possesses, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, that infallibility which the divine Redeemer willed his church to enjoy in defining doctrine concerning faith or morals. Therefore, such definitions of the Roman pontiff are of themselves, and not by the consent of the church, irreformable. So then, should anyone, which God forbid, have the temerity to reject this definition of ours: let him be anathema.[105]

On this doctrine, misunderstandings circulate up until today. First of all, the doctrine states that infallible teaching is tied to a list of strict conditions, implying that the largest portion of pontifical statements do not bear the character of infallible teaching and are therefore not necessarily definitive and binding in the sense of a Catholic dogma. The conditions required are these:

- It is the Roman Pontiff who offers a declaration
- He speaks *ex cathedra*: i.e. he speaks in his office of pastor and teacher of all Christians
- He solemnly defines a doctrine. This requires a verbal formula indicating that the teaching expressed is definitive (e.g.: "We declare," or "We define," ...)
- He expresses a doctrine concerning faith or morals
- The doctrine expressed must be held by the whole church

This said, the only declaration of a dogma since the declaration of infallibility itself, was proposed by Pope Pius XII in November 1950, when he declared the Assumption of Mary to be a dogma. Let us return to the nineteenth-century debate however. The aftermath of this notorious definition is particularly interesting. At the moment the Constitution *Pastor aeternus* was solemnly voted on July 18, 1870, a group of 61 bishops, most of them belonging to the German Empire, had left the council and returned home.

---

[105] Vatican Council I, *Pastor aeternus*, Chapter 4, n. 9.

Wanting to spare the Catholic faithful of a Catholic Church thus divided, they decided to leave before the vote, so that the traditionally required quasi unanimity could be reached. Later on, they did send in messages of adherence to the decisions of the First Vatican Council, declaring, in an 1875 *Declaratio collectiva*, that the proper role of the bishops in the church was to be respected and stressing that bishops were more than mere papal legates. Pius IX would not neglect these sensitivities and even defend them in his letter *Mirabilis illa constantia*—a document that will be picked up during many interventions at the Second Vatican Council.[106]

On top of this, worse came to worse in the political realm. A day after the solemn promulgation of the dogmatic constitution, on July 19, 1870, the Franco-Prussian War broke out. This made it impossible for many of the French and German bishops to return to Rome, and forced Pius IX to adjourn the council *sine die*, without indicating a date for reopening. In Germany, influential Catholic theologians such as Döllinger and a group of followers refused to accept the declaration;[107] and many of them entered the Old Catholic Church.[108] Again, the *Roman Question* came to the fore. As a result of his warfare with the Prussian army, Napoleon III had to pull back the French military still stationed in the papal territories, which provided Vittorio Emmanuele and the Piemontese troops with the perfect occasion for completing their own mission: On September 20, they neared the city of Rome, having occupied most of the remaining papal territories. And finally, on October 9, 1870, they occupied the city of Rome itself and annexed the Papal States to the Italian Kingdom, offering only the Vatican Hill on loan to the pope and his curia.

5. *Vatican I's Forgotten Agenda*

Most literature on the First Vatican Council ends here. The focus is usually just on the two documents we have discussed above, namely, the dogmatic constitutions that reached an official promulgation.[109] This however, does

---

[106] See *Readings in Church Authority: Gifts and Challenges for Contemporary Catholicism*, ed. Gerard Mannion et al. (Burlington, 2003), p. 268.

[107] Cf. Alfred Plummer, *Conversations with Dr. Döllinger 1870–1890*, ed. Robrecht Boudens and Leo Kenis [BETL 67] (Louvain, 1985).

[108] Cf. Anne Kiener, *Les vieux-catholiques de Vatican I à Vatican II: Un siècle de rupture avec Rome et d'union avec Utrecht* (Strasbourg, 2000).

[109] This was not the case for interesting studies such as the one by Henri Rondet, *Vatican I: Le concile de Pie IX, la préparation, les méthodes de travail, les schémas restés en suspens* (Paris, 1962).

not do justice to the council organized by Pius IX, for it tends to claim that this council had only two points of interest—even when one should admit that the pope himself had put these items at the very top of the conciliar agenda.

As we have mentioned, other commissions than just the Doctrinal Commission set out to prepare drafts for conciliar debate, too. For instance, on January 18, 1870, two of such texts were distributed among the council fathers. In the light of the postconciliar German Declaration mentioned above, the "Schema on the Bishops" deserves special reference. The project numbered seven chapters, and, devoted to church structures and the need for church reform, it is often neglected. It is, however, important to realize that Vatican I did initially show attention to the role and function of bishops in the church. A list of issues was presented in this document, ranging from the duty of residency, the need for *ad limina* visits, the organization of provincial and diocesan synods, and to the role of general vicars in Catholic dioceses. Also, the document focused attention on the relationship between the bishops and the pope, something that would cause great discussion again at Vatican II.

The focusing of attention on bishops was even more prominent, since another schema dealt specifically with the issue of the vacancy of episcopal sees. This problematic was a result of the ever shifting borders of modern nation states, causing ancient diocesan structures and frontiers to disappear and presenting the church with the need to restructure its dioceses. One notices here that Vatican I was trying to deal with a complex new context that differed strongly from the Tridentine era.

On January 14, 1870, another two schemas were distributed to the council fathers: one on priesthood and the other on the catechism. The "Schema on the Life and Morals of the Priests," offered a small codex on the life of the priest at the end of the nineteenth century, discussing items such as tonsure, the need to avoid public spectacles, the importance of the breviary, and the importance of Sunday preaching. This schema caused some discussion on the importance of local adjustments of priestly life, as well as on the importance of celibacy. In this context it should be noted that even if the Council of Trent had officially endorsed the medieval celibacy rule as a disciplinary measure, various Tridentine bishops still continued living with their own courtesans . . . and the official discipline was not always lived out in actual practice.

The "Schema on the Catechism" was equally important, as it reacted to the fact that since the Council of Trent a multitude of local catechisms,

of varying quality and completeness, had been spread among the faithful. This led to the proposal of preparing one universal catechism, in Latin, in analogy to the catechism prepared by Robert Bellarmine. Nevertheless, the council already earlier discussed the possibility of translating this universal catechism into the vernacular, and the issue of its possible adaptation to the local context.

Other schemata were prepared by the pre-conciliar commission, yet never distributed among the fathers, nor never discussed. The latter was the case for a "Schema on the Missions." Since the Council of Trent, the Catholic Church had become very active in the missionary field and this created an urgent need for a unified approach to the activities of Catholic missionaries. A decree was projected about the need to create an indigenous clergy, in which it was stressed that these local priests and bishops were not to be considered second rank ecclesiastics. In the same context, the problem of the relationship between local diocesan bishops and members of religious orders, often active on the same territories, was addressed.

A text that was never distributed was the "Schema on the Social Question," raising—more than Franzelin did in his theological drafts—the issue of the need for the church to support the poor, the working class, and reacting against excessive socialism and communism as well as excessive liberalism. As many of the drafts never officially promulgated, this text on the social question went into the Vatican Archives. Even if only the doctrinal drafts made it to the end, this did not necessarily mean that these other schemata were forever buried. Former council fathers who would later become pope, such as Leo XIII, made good use of the documentation and preparations available in the archives, when drafting important encyclicals such as *Rerum novarum*,[110] and *Satis cognitum*.[111]

After the fall of Rome in 1870, Pius IX's pontificate features no more major events. Nevertheless, Pius IX remained active on the international political scene, coping with the overall new global political situation. In line with his council, he defended his central role, while at the same time arranging an impressive series of concordats with modern states to

[110] Leo XIII, 'Rerum novarum (May 15, 1891),' *ASS* 23 (1890–1), 641–70.

[111] Leo XIII, 'Satis cognitum (June 29, 1896),' *ASS* 28 (1895–6), 708–39. This document upholds the ecclesiology that was commonly held in the years before the Second Vatican Council. The church is said to be a perfect society and a divine kingdom. It strongly defends the primacy of the Roman Pontiff as taught at the First Vatican Council.

ensure and defend the rights of Catholics worldwide. Concordats were made with Spain, Austria, Portugal, Haiti, Ecuador, etc. Most of the diplomatic activity, however, was carried out by his Secretary of State. Pope Pius IX was suffering from old age and poor health. He passed away on February 7, 1878.

CHAPTER TWO

STRUGGLING WITH MODERNITY

In this second chapter, we will focus on Roman Catholic historical high-points during the pontificates of the Popes Leo XIII and Pius X. Together, these pontificates represent three decades of developments. In this period, church leadership confronted challenges in several areas: social (the issue of overburdened and oppressed workers), politics (the church's relationship with the new Italian nation, with *laïcité* in France, etc.), liturgical (content and form adapted to the twentieth century) and theological (dealing with the methodology and findings of historical science). After a general discussion of Pope Leo XIII's pontificate, this chapter will contain an overview of theological developments and currents. Next, we will survey church historical developments under Pope Pius X and theological issues during his pontificate.

1. *Leo XIII: On the Threshold of the Twentieth Century*

The conclave organized in 1878, after the death of Pius IX, was one of the historically shorter ones. After only two days, the cardinals gathered in Rome elected the then *camerlengo* and Archbishop of Perugia, Cardinal Vincenzo Pecci. Pecci was a well-known and influential figure, who had already played a major role under his predecessor. Upon his initiative, a Belgian Pontifical College was established in Rome in 1844; and he spent several weeks in England with bishop Nicholas Wiseman, carefully reviewing the status of the Catholic Church there. Pecci had called a provincial council, in order to reform religious life in his diocese; and he had greatly expanded his own diocesan seminary and appointed a number of new and prominent Thomist professors. In his diocese he had also taken several well-publicized initiatives in support of Catholic charities: founding homes for homeless boys and girls, and for the elderly; and opening branches of a bank, *Monte de Pietà*, which focused on low-income people and provided low interest loans. In many ways, he would continue the line of conduct set out by Pope Pius IX; yet naturally, there would also be elements of change.

Pope Leo XIII inherited his predecessor's struggles with political regimes in several regions.[1] We have already mentioned the *Kulturkampf* church struggles and tensions with Bismarck. These were still lingering at the beginning of Leo's pontificate; but under Leo XIII compromises were reached informally and anti-Catholic attacks subsided. The German Centre Party, encouraged by Leo's support for social welfare legislation, represented Catholic interests and was a positive force for social change.

More problematic for Catholics however would be the climate in France, where the arrival of Jules Grévy as President of the Third Republic would lead to strong anti-Catholic attitudes and sentiments and a new wave of Enlightenment inspired anticlericalism. Also, in the 1890s the French Republic would be divided by the so-called Dreyfus Affair, in which Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish army captain had been falsely accused and sentenced by a military court. This came into the open due to a public letter by Émile Zola, entitled *J'accuse*, and became a great scandal.[2] As a result of anti-Semitic Christian attacks on the Jews, in the wake of the scandal, Catholics too were considered suspicious. At the same time, the French government had started its politics of "laicizing" French society, pressured by the *Bloc Républicain*, an alliance of "left wing" republican parties. These policies implied the confiscation of Catholic properties (hospitals, schools, monasteries) and great coercion was put on Catholic citizens. Pope Leo XIII reacted cautiously, with a rather diplomatic policy of "*ralliement*," but this did not help.[3] Many French Catholics openly reacted against government legislation. The situation worsened in the beginning of the twentieth century. In 1901 a law was passed that no religious associations were to exist, unless they had obtained explicit government permits. This law became effective in 1905 under Émile Combes, French Prime Minister from 1902 to 1905. Under Combes, French Catholicism suffered severely, reminding the Vatican of what had happened under Bismarck in Germany before.[4]

---

[1] Marcel Launay, *La papauté à l'aube du XX^e siècle: Léon XIII et Pie X, 1878–1914* (Paris, 1997).

[2] Émile Zola, 'J'accuse: Lettre au president de la république,' *L'Aurore* (January 13, 1898), p. 1.

[3] James E. Ward, 'The French Cardinals and Leo XIII's Ralliement Policy,' *Church History* 33 (1964), 60–73.

[4] Antoine Dansette, *Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine: Sous la troisième république* [L'histoire] (Paris, 1951), 2:300–6. More recent background information is found in Jean-Pierre Scot, 'Génèse de la loi de 1905,' in *Faut-il réviser la loi de 1905*, ed. Yves Charles Zarka (Paris, 2005), pp. 7–56. Also see Émile Combes, *Mon ministère: Mémoires 1902–1905* (Paris, 1956).

The 1905 "Act of Separation" abolished the French-Vatican Concordat. This was a result of the 1904 legislation, which forbade clergy (both secular and religious) from being actively involved in education and health care. As a result, some 10,000 French schools were closed, houses of formation for religious orders and congregations were abandoned; and thousands of religious fled the country, organizing their programs of formation and education outside France's borders. Combes's administration entirely destroyed the Public Law status of Catholicism in the French Republic. All temporal goods and properties were to be held by "*associations cultuelles*" (cult associations) and these could not be headed by local priests, but had to be in lay hands. As a result, many parish churches were closed and abandoned. In 1906 the new Pope, Pius X, abandoned the Vatican *ralliement* policy and went on frontal attack with his encyclical *Gravissimo officii munere*, as well as in the French-written encyclical *Une fois encore*. In the latter document, he opposed the strict separation of church and state in France and issued a clear condemnation of all Catholics affiliated with the state controlled *associations cultuelles*,[5] stating unequivocally that "au point de vue de l'exercice du culte, cette loi a organisé l'anarchie." Although the new prime minister, Maurice Rouvier, had continued Combes's political stances, the government decided to pass the 1907 bill to offer church properties on loan to Catholics, but keep churches, seminaries, diocesan palaces, etc. in government hands. It is not unreasonable to assume that this decision was made due to questions about a religion that, at this time, was drawing more converts.[6]

Leo XIII, just as Pius IX, would head the Catholic Church for a long period and turned out to be a tireless writer. He promulgated no less than 86 encyclicals on a wide range of topics. First of all, he would perceive of himself as a pope who had to carry out and apply the principles and decisions taken by the First Vatican Council, in which he had himself played an important role.[7] Therefore he stressed the importance of spreading Catholicism throughout all layers of society, and having it play a central role in the organizational structures of society. In his policies

[5] Pius X, 'Gravissimo munere (August 10, 1906),' *ASS* 39 (1906), p. 389; Pius X, 'Une fois encore (January 6, 1907),' *ASS* 40 (1907), pp. 3–11.

[6] See Frédéric Gugelot, *La conversion des intellectuels au catholicisme en France, 1885–1935* (Paris, 1998).

[7] *Le pontificat de Leon XIII: Renaissances du Saint-Siège?*, ed. Philippe Levillain [Collection de l'école française de Rome 368] (Rome, 2006).

toward the modern nation states, shaped in previous decades, he had a double approach.

On the one hand, Pope Leo made it clear that he had no preference for any particular governance form, whether a republic or a monarchy. Governance form was secondary to the actual goal of creating a Catholic society. As a result of this, he promoted the freedom to form unions, freedom of press, and freedom of opinion. In his mind, all of these freedoms could be used by Catholics to promote and spread their ideas. Leo XIII could also take a more pragmatic and less hostile stance on church and state relations, as expressed in his encyclical *Immortale Dei*.[8] Therein the pope underlined the church's divine origins and maintained the classic thesis-hypothesis theory; but he also pointed to the need for Catholic citizens to be law abiding, respectful, and obedient citizens.[9]

At the same time, Pope Leo XIII stressed that religion is important for the wellbeing of citizens and that the state should respect and promote religious adherence (read: Catholicism). Leo asserted as well that if the state went so far as persecuting Catholics, there would be limits to Catholics's civil allegiance duty. To a certain extent, via this approach—based on the biblical principle of "giving to Caesar what belongs to Caesar"—Pope Leo XIII succeeded in smoothening church-state relationships, pointing to the complementary character of both "societies," each with its own powers and liberties. This is largely to be understood against the background of the French Third Republic, which by the end of the nineteenth century had taken a more aggressive position against religion. The pope openly expressed the need for the church to engage in pacts with national states, in order to safeguard peace and liberty. The best way to do so, was by creating bilateral agreements under the form of concordats. Leo set up a wide international network of papal nuncios, which safeguarded the immediate contact between local episcopates and the Holy See. All the while, Leo's actions had another major impact: the promotion of Roman centralism. For a start, very much in continuity with Pius IX, he expressed his concerns about modern liberalism in the 1888 encyclical *Libertas praestantissimum*, continuing the approach set forth in *Mirari vos* and *Pio Nono*'s *Syllabus of errors*.[10]

---

[8] Leo XIII, 'Immortale Dei (November 1, 1885),' *ASS* 18 (1885), 162–175.

[9] On Leo XIII's political positionings, see the excellent volume *The Papacy and the New World Order: Vatican Diplomacy, Catholic Opinion and International Politics at the Time of Leo XIII, 1878–1903*, ed. Vincent Viaene (Louvain, 2005).

[10] Leo XIII, 'Libertas praestantissimum (June 20, 1888),' *ASS* 20 (1888), 593–613.

Very mindful of the declaration of papal infallibility, which strengthened the centralizing power of the Roman Pontiff (and had a strongly political impact as became clear in the Bismarckean *Kulturkampf*), Pope Leo reinforced papal centralism to a high degree. In his perspective, the figure of the Roman Pontiff was a key point of reference and a model for the whole of society. Leo XIII strongly promoted papal devotion, especially via his promotion of neo-Thomism.

On the social plane, church leadership was confronting the labor question, where social justice was the central issue. Here again, the background of Leo XIII's attitude lies with Vatican I, as well as with his interest in promoting the Catholic presence at all levels of society. Quite often *Rerum novarum*, the encyclical promulgated by Leo XIII in 1891 is presented as a striking element of renewal in comparison to the pontificate of Pius IX.[11] On occasion, one even finds the pontificate of Leo XIII being narrowed down to his stance on social justice, which results in unilateral judgments. This does not, however, take into account the broader background of the document, which developed from a multitude of factors. First, we have made clear that Catholics in the German Empire as well as other territories had already been long involved and engaged in social action movements. In that regard, one thinks immediately of the importance of previously mentioned bishops such as Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler. One cannot neglect the role of worker unions being set up in these regions.

Next, considering the document drafts at Vatican I that did not end up being a conciliar decree, one is reminded of the fact that contemporary social questions were already on the agenda of the council. The fact that no single conciliar document arose on this theme resulted out of the impact of the Franco-Prussian War causing the council to be adjourned *sine die*. Precisely this adjournment had raised the expectation of its being later reopened and therefore of the possibility that remaining issues would still be addressed. When preparing for his famous encyclical, Leo XIII made use of the conciliar drafts already written on the subject.

Third, already since 1884 Catholic social thinkers had been actively engaged in the organization of annual Catholic conferences at Fribourg, Switzerland. The members of this "Union of Fribourg" coming from a variety of countries (France, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, Italy), published the acts of these conferences and were received by Leo XIII in 1888 to discuss their ideas. In general, within Catholicism, the results of

[11] Leo XIII, 'Rerum novarum (May 15, 1891),' *ASS* 23 (1890–91), 641–70.

the Industrial Revolution had caused a sometimes alarming awareness of the consequences of progress. Social balances were changing and workers were exploited and denied fundamental rights. Entire families (including small children) were forced to work in factories without fair wages. Many parish priests were already committed to the fate of the poor. One thinks of priests such as the Belgian Adolf Daens who, from the beginning of the 1870s, entered into conflict with both his bishop and Catholic factory owners over the social situation of his parishioners. The abovementioned clarifies that the church could not take a clear position on the subject without also touching upon the sensitive issue of church and state relationships. This too, made for a long process of reflection needed to prepare a carefully delineated standpoint.

The combination of all of these factors led to Leo XIII's decision to draft a comprehensive encyclical on the Catholic position on social justice. The encyclical *Rerum novarum* was promulgated on May 15, 1891. The document is rather elaborate and aims at offering a *via media* between the Scylla of excessive socialism and Communism on the one hand (both condemned on various occasions previously) and the Charybdis of pure liberal capitalism on the other hand. The encyclical consists of two large parts. Part one continues the nineteenth-century tradition of condemnations and displays a rather negative attitude. It clarifies why socialism is not the best option for resolving social questions: It is unjust in its tendency to deny the importance of personal property, misjudges the role of the state, and results in enslaving people under state rule. This position on socialism must also be understood against the background that socialism often coincided with an ideological struggle against religion as such. On the other hand the results of free capitalism were attacked for promoting egoism and leading into situations where some Christians impoverished their fellow Catholics.

The encyclical's second part offers a more constructive position. It presents the church's own solution, in three subsequent steps. First, it describes the role of the Catholic Church. Its proper identity and the principles and doctrines upheld by the church on the basis of the Gospel give the church the right to speak out on this matter. The church cannot accept any "contract" between employers and workers, which tends to describe a very minimal wage as a just wage. Pope Leo XIII stresses the need for an honest balance between labor and capital. In a second step the role of the state is discussed: In line with the principles he had laid out in other writings, Leo claimed that the proper obligations and duties of civil powers included the safeguarding of the wellbeing of all its citizens, both on a social and

an individual level. As a result, civil powers are urged to defend the individual liberty of their citizens, while at the same time protecting the poor from mechanisms of social exclusion. The state is asked to protect the right to private property, to prevent strikes from occurring, and to care for the physical and mental health of its citizens, as well as to be alert to the need for just wages for workers. A third step then addresses all parties involved in social conflict and points to the need for harmonious cooperation between labor unions and employers. The encyclical clearly stresses the rights of workers to organize and form labor unions, also unions based on a religious foundation. Again, one should not forget that this approach was also seen as a way of uniting Catholics, on a worldwide scale, around the center of Catholicism: the Roman Pontiff.

1.1. *Gazing across the Atlantic*

The international scope and interests of Pope Leo XIII's pontificate lead us, as well, to another issue: the Catholic Church in the United States. The United States of America had long attracted Leo's special attention. Due to immigration from first primarily Ireland and then from Germany and Italy, the Catholic population in the United States had grown significantly in the nineteenth century. In 1790 there had been 35,000 Catholics. The figure increased to 195,000 in 1820; and then ballooned to about 1.6 million in 1850. This meant that by 1850, 25% of the total US population was Roman Catholic. By the end of the century there would be 12 million Catholics in the United States of America. The strength and impact of the U.S. hierarchy had grown as well. Throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, the U.S. Catholic episcopate held three national meetings (in 1852, 1866, and 1884), under the presidency of the Archbishop of Baltimore, since he was the metropolitan leader of the U.S. Catholic Church in that era. The decrees of these synodal sessions organized the life of the American Catholic Church to a high degree; and the process was closely followed by Leo XIII, who finally approved the American decrees in 1884. Two years later, Pope Leo XIII elevated the Archbishop of Baltimore, James Gibbons, to the cardinalate.[12] The pope was fascinated by the fact that the constitutional provision for religious liberty in the U.S., based on the principle of a free church in a free state, could be applied in an atmosphere entirely different from that of the *Risorgimento* movement in Italy

[12] John Tracy Ellis, *The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore* (Milwaukee, 1952).

and that it need not be a threat to the freedom of Catholic citizens. The differences between the 1789 anticlerical French Revolution and the 1776 American Revolution attracted his genuine interest, which lead to documents such as the 1894 encyclical *Praeclara Gratulationis Publicae*.[13] This encyclical reflected a cautious openness toward Catholic participation in the "World Parliament of Religions," that had taken place a year before in Chicago.[14] Nevertheless, Pope Leo XIII's attitude remained somewhat ambiguous,[15] since he was careful about safeguarding Catholicism's claim that it was the only true religion.

In line with the doctrinal principles of Vatican I, on the relationship between church and State, and with *Rerum novarum*, Leo XIII condemned excessive views on the separation of church and state and tendencies towards religious individualism. These factors posed a threat, and could lead to a too liberal position, which was no longer in agreement with Catholic doctrine. There were growing fears about American liberalism being exported to Europe, especially after the French language publication of a biography of the American Catholic priest and founder of the Paulist Fathers: Isaac Thomas Hecker.[16] French Catholic reformers greatly admired Hecker's courage, piety, assertive self-initiative, and love of modern times and modern liberty. Activist French priests, inspired by Hecker, began the task of persuading their fellow priests to accept the French political system, to break out of their isolation and fear of modernity, and to actively engage themselves in the intellectual life of the country. In 1897 the French Catholic activist movement received an added impetus, when Monsignor Denis J. O'Connell, former Rector of the Pontifical North American College in Rome, spoke in defense of Isaac Hecker's ideas at the Catholic Congress in Fribourg. Conservative European Catholics reacted with alarm at what they considered symptoms of pernicious Modernism and a dangerous American liberalism.[17] They complained to the pope that such American ideas placed too much stress on individual initiative, were

---

[13] Leo XIII, 'Praeclara Gratulationis Publicae (June 20, 1894),' ASS 26 (1893–4), 705–17.

[14] *The Dawn of Religious Pluralism: Voices From the World's Parliament of Religions, 1893*, ed. Richard Hughes and Ronald R. Kidd (LaSalle, 1993).

[15] Cf. John Tracy Ellis's famous essay, 'Church and State: An American Catholic Tradition,' *Harper's Magazine* 207 (November, 1953), 63–7. For more recent historiography, see Gerald P. Fogarty, *The Vatican and the American Catholic Hierarchy from 1870 to 1965* (Wilmington DE, 1983).

[16] For background, see David J. O'Brien, *Isaac Hecker: An American Catholic* (New York, 1992).

[17] Cf. Claude Fohlen, 'Catholicisme américain et catholicisme européen: La convergence de l'Américanisme,' *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* 34 (1987), 215–30;

incompatible with fundamental Catholic principles, and undermined Catholic obedience to authority.

An official condemnation of the perceived heresies of "Americanism" came in the 1895 encyclical *Longinqua oceani*.[18] There Pope Leo began with a generally positive view of American Catholics and recognized the tremendous growth and development of Catholicism in the United States. He warned, however, that the church in the United States would bring forth more abundant fruits if in addition to stressing liberty it would also enjoy the patronage of public authority. Pope Leo warned the U.S. hierarchy that they should not support the separation of church and state and wrote that he would prefer that they work toward a closer relationship between the Catholic Church and the U.S. State, along European lines. Pope Leo was also growing concerned about American biblical scholarship. The issue of "Americanism" continued to simmer and the pope came out more strongly condemnatory in an apostolic letter addressed to Cardinal Gibbons in 1899: *Testem benevolentiae*.[19]

In his 1899 letter, the pope again expressed his concern about a growing liberalism (read: Modernism) in the Catholic Church in the United States. He stressed that Catholics cannot decide doctrine for themselves and must obey the magisterial teaching authority of the church. He found exposing Catholic young people to public schools was a dangerous practice and should to be avoided as much as possible. The pope also found it a dangerous practice to openly and publicly discuss theological opinions. And, Pope Leo XIII condemned both the biography of Isaac Hecker (most probably because of an introduction written by the French priest Félix Klein) and "Americanism." In fact, *Testem benevolentiae* did not assert that either Hecker or American Catholics in general adhered to unsound doctrine. He simply asked the American bishops to be on alert and if there were any unsound beliefs in the Catholic Church in the United States, they were to be eradicated.

In their response to *Testem benevolentiae*, Cardinal James Gibbons and a nearly unanimous U.S. hierarchy strongly denied that American Catholics held any of the views condemned by the pope; and they stressed that Isaac Hecker, who had died years before his biography appeared, would have never departed from sound Catholic teaching. Although most American

---

R. Scott Appleby, *Church and Age Unite! The Modernist Impulse in American Catholicism* (Notre Dame, 1992).

[18] Leo XIII, 'Longinqua Oceani (January 6, 1895),' *ASS* 27 (1894–5), 390.

[19] Leo XIII, 'Testem benevolentiae (January 22, 1899),' *ASS* 31 (1898–9), 470–9.

Catholics knew nothing about *Testem benevolentiae* nor the background issues that led to it, the encyclical effectively ended the "Americanist" movement and curtailed the activities of progressive-minded American Catholics until Vatican II. In France the papal letter greatly strengthened the position of conservative Catholics. About "Americanism," many historians now agree that it was a kind of a "phantom heresy."[20]

2. *Neo-Thomism after Vatican I*

As already shown, Vatican I can be read as the Catholic Church's first broad and official attempt to deal with the Post Enlightenment situation. In the political realm, this situation had resulted in the *Roman Question*, and the ultramontanist counter-reaction, stressing the pope as the unifying center for world Catholicism. Under Pope Pius IX, Catholicism had perceived the French Revolution and its aftermath as an anti-religious movement; and, much within the broader Romanticist movement, the church had opposed modernity in a double way. First, if modern philosophy implied an attack on Christianity, it could not possibly be embraced. This led to the condemnations of Modernism that we will discuss. One notices an overall and hostile rejection of modern philosophical principles as being anti-Christian and therefore to be condemned by the church. This rejection was the negative side of the coin. The church was also in search of its own position. Secondly, there was a longing for a restoration of pre-modern Christianity. In line with the Romanticist era, this led to the search for a model that could fully integrate philosophical thinking and Christian life and thought, working in harmony.

As indicated above, this model was found in scholasticism; and supported and promoted by thinkers such as Franzelin, Kleutgen and Perrone, neo-scholasticism became the Catholic philosophical alternative. Precisely due to the influence of these theologians under Pius IX, neo-scholasticism (and its focus on the primordial importance of the writings and thought system of Thomas Aquinas within scholasticism) had gradually developed into the church's official answer to the Enlightenment. Both signaled reorganization and a restoration of the *Ancien Régime* society, impregnated with Catholic influence on all levels, and anchored in the medieval model of philosophy and theology based on Aristotelian logic

[20] The expression was coined by Félix Klein, *Americanism: A Phantom Heresy* (Cranford, 1951).

and deductive argumentation. In sum: neo-Thomism was the church's philosophical and theological antidote to modernity.

The promotion of neo-Thomism had become most obvious in the promulgation of the encyclical *Aeterni patris* of 1879.[21] When looking at the prehistory of the document, it is clear that this encyclical promoted neo-scholasticism as an important medium for church influence on both the intellectual and the social fields. Much along the lines of his previous encyclical *Inscrutabili*, Leo XIII focused on Aquinas as the sole true guide for Christian thought, and the key model for reaching an integration of philosophical and religious discourse.[22] In the year of 1878, Leo XIII backed the foundation of an academic institute, the *Accademia Romana a Sancto Thoma Aquinate*. This new body was to promote the edition and the study of the work of Thomas Aquinas and to organize Thomistic congresses. It would be led by the pope's brother, Giuseppe Pecci, a Jesuit who was to succeed Kleutgen as the prefect of the Congregation of Seminaries and Studies in 1884. Via this congregation, the promotion of neo-Thomism would be spread automatically from the center of the church to all seminaries and Catholic universities as the ruling philosophical and theological paradigm. Rapidly, neo-Thomism would become the key factor in worldwide Catholic unification.

In 1880 Saint Thomas was declared the Patron Saint of all those committed to higher studies, and soon institutes for Thomistic study were established throughout the Catholic world, such as the Higher Institute for Philosophy, founded by Désiré-Joseph Mercier in Louvain in 1889—Mercier later became Archbishop of Mechelen.[23] Within neo-Thomism a growing specific tendency was to be observed, namely transcendental Thomism, which aimed to meet the needs of modern science and dialogue with modernity. In line with his French confrere Pierre Rousselot, Joseph

---

[21] Leo XIII, 'Aeterni patris (August 4, 1879),' *ASS* 12 (1879), 97–115. Cf. Roger Aubert, 'Die Enzyklika "Aeterni Patris" und die weiteren päpstlichen Stellungnahmen zur christlichen Philosophie,' in *Christliche Philosophie im katholischen Denken des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Emerich Coreth, Walter M. Neidl and Georg Pfligersdorffer, Vol. 2: *Rückgriff auf scholastisches Erbe* (Graz, Vienna and Cologne, 1988), pp. 310–32; Serge-Thomas Bonino, 'Le fondement doctrinal du projet Léonin: "Aeterni Patris" et la restauration du thomisme,' in *Le pontificat de Léon XIII*, pp. 267–74; Philippe Capelle, 'Le retentissement d' "Aeterni Patris" en philosophie et en théologie,' in *Le pontificat de Léon XIII*, pp. 275–84.

[22] Leo XIII, 'Inscrutabili (April 21, 1878),' *ASS* 10 (1877), 585–92.

[23] Cf. Roger Aubert, 'Désiré Mercier et les débuts de l'Institut de Philosophie,' *RPL* 88 (1990), 147–67 (reprinted in Roger Aubert, *Le cardinal Mercier, 1851–1926: Un prélat d'avant-garde*, ed. Jean-Pierre Hendrickx, Jean Pirotte and Luc Courtois (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1994), pp. 99–115.

Maréchal, a Jesuit associated with Louvain's Higher Institute, was in fact to adopt the same point of departure as modern thought: the subject. Transcendental Thomism claimed direct continuity with Thomas himself, to be found, according to Maréchal, in the subject's dynamic openness with respect to absolute Being. Echoes of Maréchal can be heard later on in the thought of Karl Rahner and Bernard Lonergan.

The Thomistic revival gave rise as well to the foundation of a series of neo-scholastic inspired periodicals, which played a crucial role in the promotion and distribution of Thomistic thought on an international level. Among the most influential one finds *Divus Thomas* (1880); *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie* (1887); *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* (1888); *Revue thomiste* (1893); *La revue néo-scolastique* (1894); the *Rivista Italiana di filosofia neoscolastica* (1909), and *Ciencia tomista* (1910). As a result of the fact that Aquinas belonged to the Dominican Order, the neo-Thomist movement was also strongly supported and promoted by Dominican friars around the world. The study of Aquinas's system of speculative argumentation was promoted as the basic platform for any scientific endeavor. This would have significant consequences during the modernist crisis, which we will address later in this book.

Under the influence of modern philosophy, with its support for contemporary critical reflection and questioning, there was a rapidly growing interest in historical studies. More and more, history departments were founded, and the historical critical method became widely accepted among scholars. This of course had consequences for Catholic scientists, too. By the middle of the nineteenth century a series of archaeological discoveries led to an increased interest in the historical study of the Ancient Near East. Western scholars were now applying critical research methods and the study of ancient languages to describe the origins of western society, including the history of the Jewish people, and the rise of early Christianity. As a result, the origins of the Christian faith were placed on center stage in academia. The emphasis on historical-critical scientific approaches did not fit well within the neo-Thomist model promoted by the church. The most notorious example of scholarship was the 1863 book *Vie de Jésus*, written by Ernest Renan. Even when the Syllabus of errors appeared a year after, the impact of this historical rather than theological approach to the life of Jesus lingered on for decades.[24]

[24] Ernest Renan, *Vie de Jésus* (Paris, 1863). On Renan's work, see François Laplanche, 'Renan et l'exégèse biblique: De l'histoire sainte à l'histoire des religions,' in *Actes des*

More and more, Catholic priests were also becoming engaged in critical historical scholarship and started studying biblical history from the perspective of an historiographer rather than from a purely doctrinal perspective—as had been done within the neo-Thomist paradigm, where both Scripture and Tradition were regarded as two distinct "sources of revelation." In neo-Thomist theological treatises, as found in seminaries and Catholic universities, the scriptures were used as "proof texts" and citations from the scriptures applied as elements of logically structured argumentation. In sum, they were integrated into the overall speculative paradigm.

The opposite was the case for scholars such as Maurice d'Hulst, the rector of the newly founded *Institut catholique de Paris*, who in 1893 had published an article entitled *La Question Biblique*.[25] Soon, this so-called *Biblical Question* rose to the core of the agenda. Thus, another thought paradigm, integrating a methodology that did not belong to the neo-Thomist approach but resonated more with "modern" thinking, again entered Catholicism and was stirring up questions. On top of that, these new scholars were making the divinely revealed scriptures, proposed by Vatican I as one of the two loci containing supernatural revelation, a subject of critical investigation. Apparently, they tended to question the notion of revelation itself. In a neo-Thomist thought world, revelation consisted of a set of divinely revealed truths, which were as such free from contextual influences and above contingency. In sum: the understanding had been that revealed propositions are supra-historical. The new late nineteenth-century tendencies defied both neo-Thomism as the ruling Catholic thought system and the nature of revelation, as defended by Vatican I.

On November 18, 1893, Pope Leo XIII reacted and promulgated an encyclical devoted entirely to the biblical question: *Providentissimus Deus*.[26] In the new encyclical, he did not adopt the hostile discourse of Pius IX's *Syllabus*, but proposed that the Catholic position be maintained in the field of Catholic scholarship. Pope Leo did conceive the encyclical as a reaction against "rationalism" illustrating that for him the biblical question

---

journées d'étude d'Ernest Renan (*13–15 mars 1992*), ed. Robert Uriac (Saint Brieuc, 1992), p. 87.

[25] Maurice d'Hulst, 'La question biblique,' *Le correspondant* 50 (1893), 201–51. Cf. Émile Goichot, *Alfred Loisy et ses amis* [Histoire] (Paris, 2002), pp. 27–9; Francesco Beretta, *Monseigneur d'Hulst et la science chrétienne: Portrait d'un intellectuel* [Textes, Dossiers, Documents 16] (Paris, 1996), pp. 99–123.

[26] Pius X, 'Providentissimus Deus (September 7, 1907),' *ASS* 26 (1893–4), 269–92.

was something springing from "modernity" and therefore to be treated with suspicion. In his reaction against rationalism, Leo XIII remained traditionally conservative about the use of the historical-critical method in biblical exegesis. He declared that the text of the scriptures was inerrant and insisted that the basis for biblical interpretation had to be the *sensus litteralis*: the literal meaning. When interpreting difficult passages, the *analogia fidei* (analogy of faith) was to be followed, i.e. any interpretation of Scripture was to be in agreement with the Catholic faith tradition.

The notion of scriptural inerrancy (1) was a consequence of (2) the principle of a *Deus Auctor*, God being the only true author of the biblical text, which in turn resulted in (3) an instrumentalist view of scriptural inspiration. In other words, the human authors of the biblical books were mere instruments, noting down what they received word for word. In spite of this threefold principle, the encyclical still stimulated biblical studies in the Roman Catholic Church. From this perspective, the use of a scientific methodology in biblical studies was ultimately encouraged, albeit with the necessary caution and under the condition that it be pursued within the overarching neo-scholastic tradition. Leo XIII supported the study of oriental languages, for example, archaeology, and other related disciplines. In the end, however, everything remained subject to the church's magisterial authority. The encyclical insists, on the one hand, that the meaning of the scriptures cannot be found without divine faith nor outside the Catholic Church. On the other hand, however, Leo XIII was clearly interested in the potential advantages of scientific, linguistic, and even historical studies. It was Leo XIII, remember, who opened the Secret Vatican Archives to scholarly investigation. In this sense, Pope Leo XIII's attitude constitutes a shift away from the attitude of Pius IX, an attitude that would reappear on the scene with Leo's successor.

3. *Pius X: A Reform Pope*

After the death of Leo XIII in July 1903, the new conclave suffered from the tensions of national states being played out in the balloting rounds for a new pope. Leo XIII had given the papacy an enormous international spiritual and social influence. Thanks to Pope Leo XIII, international political leaders had become keenly aware of the importance of the election for a new pope. Moreover, they could actively interfere, since according to tradition, state governments had a right to express their veto against

a candidate for the papacy via the cardinals representing the wishes of their respective countries. On the eve of this conclave, the governments of France, Germany, Austria, Italy and Spain attempted to exercise just such an influence. While in German and Austrian circles support was found for Cardinal Girolamo Maria Gotti, the French often favored Cardinal Mariano Rampolla del Tindaro. The latter's chances would be blocked by a veto expressed on behalf of Austria, by Cardinal Puzyna de Kosielsko, Archbishop of Krakow. As a result, the chances of Gotti were equally blocked, which lead to the election of Cardinal Giuseppe Sarto, the Patriarch of Venice.

Cardinal Sarto—who immediately appointed as his new Secretary of State, Cardinal Rafael Merry del Val—was well known to the public as a warm and pastoral personality, and an enthusiastic and dynamic church leader. Sarto chose the name of Pius X, indicating his self-perception as a Pope in a struggle with modernity, which would become highly apparent during the modernist crisis. Nevertheless, the emphasis on his anti-modernist struggle has often overshadowed any attention to Pope Pius X's pastoral commitment. Therefore we wish to begin with that side of his pontificate. Pius X's actions in the pastoral field put him squarely in the pattern established by his immediate predecessors: striving for Catholic unification, with the role of the pope at the top and center of Catholicism. This top-to-bottom hierarchical view of Catholic ecclesiology—resulting largely out of the *Roman Question* and the Counter-Enlightenment—was set forth in two new domains: liturgy and canon law.

Already in 1904, Pius X had made it quite clear that his opinion on the international role of the Holy See and the relationship between the Vatican and the nation states was fully in the line of the thesis-hypothesis model. The church's divine foundation was stressed, and consequently the position that the power of the Roman Pontiff stood above all worldly leadership on the part of civil authorities. This organizational principle, theologically addressed and defined by Vatican I, would soon be fixed into juridical terms, since Pius X commissioned Cardinal Pietro Gasparri, in 1904, to draft a single unified code of canon law for the Catholic Church. Up until that time, canon law had been rooted in a long tradition of jurisprudence, commentaries on the Lombardian *Sententiae*, and discussions about the juridical implications of magisterial teaching. Gasparri's work—with the help of the young Eugenio Pacelli—would unify canon law and provide clear legal principles to be applied everywhere. Moreover, the new *Code of Canon Law*, only to be completed and promulgated in 1917,

would receive and canonize Vatican I's theologically developed church view in terms of juridical church structures.[27]

The second domain was the liturgy, very dear to the heart of Pope Pius X, as can be illustrated by a range of decisions. In 1905 he had issued a decree stimulating and encouraging daily mass and regular reception of communion. In subsequent years, he would support various initiatives to promote the idea that the grace received at communion was an adequate remedy against human moral weakness and contributed to the wellbeing of society. In 1910 this led to the lowering of the age for children's first communion, which until then had been on the age of fourteen. Henceforth, children could receive communion at the age of seven, provided they comprehended the difference between "regular" bread and the effect of the consecration of the bread in terms of transsubstantiation. This had a significant effect on the practice of catechesis, which thereafter tended to focus more and more on sacramental devotion and devotional practices based on child-like innocence.

In the liturgical realm, church music was another of Pope Pius X's great interests. He reacted strongly against the current Italian liturgical practice, where church music was often rooted in a rather spectacular "opera culture." Along the lines of the neo-Thomist reform, Pius X promoted medieval Gregorian chant instead. This resulted in a thoroughly revised *Graduale* (the Roman Catholic Church's hymn book for the Eucharist) and a revision of the *Antifonarium* (the hymn book for the vespers). Both initiatives were confided to the French Benedictine Abbey of Solesmes, where the legacy of Dom Guéranger was still vividly present.

On the level of priestly life—and in continuity with the "Schema on Priestly Life" prepared at Vatican I—Pius X promoted a simplification and reform of the breviary, in order to stress the importance of the daily and universal prayer of ordained Catholic ministers. But this pontificate's impact on church life stretched farther. Perhaps one of the most influential organizational decisions made by Pius X was his reform of the Roman Curia. On June 29, 1908, he issued the Apostolic Constitution *Sapienti consilio*.[28] The step molded the ancient curial offices into a well-organized

---

[27] *Codex iuris canonici Pii X Pontificis iussu digestus, Benedicti Papae XV auctoritate promulgatus*, ed. P. Gasparri (Vatican City, 1917).

[28] Pius X, 'Sapienti Consilio (June 29, 1908),' *AAS* 1 (1909), 7–19. In the same year of 1908, further reglementation was offered in documents such as the *Ordo servandus in sacris Congregationibus, Tribunalibus, Officiis Romanae Curiae*; and the *Lex propria S. Romanae Rotae et Signaturae Apostolicae*. For a general study on the Roman Curia, which includes

instrument of church government. The pope reduced the number of Congregations from twenty-three to twelve; and he carefully redefined their respective areas of competence. He reorganized tribunals, such as the Roman Rota, and carried through an internal reform of the Holy See's Secretariat of State. As of this pontificate, the Roman Curia would serve the pope in his universal church governance more than ever before.

4. *Modernism and Anti-Modernism*

Pope Leo XIII had warned cautiously about the dangers of rationalism and the dangers of "modern theology." The Catholic struggle with modernity, in the aftermath of *Providentissimus Deus*, would take a strongly different turn under his successor, Pius X.

As we have already indicated, the new Pope's choice of the name "Pius" already pointed toward a certain continuity with Pius IX. This would become all the more clear in the way this pope dealt with the so-called *Biblical Question*, which had remained unresolved within circles of Catholic biblical scholars. Different opinions were held on biblical exegesis; and scholars legitimized their own methodology, based on their respective reception of Leo XIII's encyclical. Now at stake under Pope Pius X were two paradigms for scientific research, philosophy, and theology developing simultaneously yet separately. Very basically, the modernist crisis would be understood as a clash between secular scientific progress and the church's own neo-scholastic scientific model. In order to sketch the crisis we will first offer an overview of some of the main protagonists of Modernism and then focus on the church's authoritative reactions against them.[29]

---

materials regarding the reform of 1908, see a.o. Niccolò del Re, *La Curia Romana: Lineamenti storico-giuridici* (Rome, 1970).

[29] On the Modernist Crisis, see, a.o., Émile Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique dans la crise moderniste* [Religion et sociétés] (Tournai, 1962), reprinted with a new introduction: *Histoire, dogme et critique dans la crise moderniste* [Bibliothèque de l'évolution de l'humanité] (Paris, 1996); Pierre Colin, *L'audace et le soupcon: La crise moderniste dans le catholicisme français, 1893–1914* [Anthropologiques] (Paris, 1997); the first four chapters of François Laplanche, *La crise de l'origine: La science catholique des Évangiles et l'histoire au XX^e siècle* [Bibliothèque de l'évolution de l'humanité] (Paris, 2006); James C. Livingston, *Modern Christian Thought* (Minneapolis, 1997, second edition in 2006), 1:356–83; Charles J.T. Talar, *Rereading, Reception and Rhetoric: Approaches to Roman Catholic Modernism* [American University Studies, Series 7: Theology and Religion 106] (New York, 1999); Étienne Fouilloux, *Une Église en quête de liberté: La pensée catholique française entre modernisme et Vatican II, 1914–1962* [Anthropologiques] (Paris, 1998).

By the end of the nineteenth century, particularly in France, religious science had developed strongly in milieus of Catholic scholars who had adopted the methods of their colleagues in secular science departments. Scholars like Louis Duchesne and Alfred Loisy were of particular importance because they stressed the necessity of academic investigative freedom and insisted on setting aside dogmatic starting points, in their research activities. Around the turn of the century, their colleague scholar Pierre Battifol noted that "une jeune génération s'est mise à l'oeuvre, intélligente, active, passionnée pour tous les problèmes que soulève l'histoire religieuse."[30]

Although Pius X would condemn Modernism as a philosophical and theological thought system that constituted the "synthesis of all heresies"—having in mind the heresies refuted throughout the nineteenth century—it should be stressed that initially, the modernists did not act as a group, nor did they define a clear system. They also had no intention of promoting heretical opinions. In fact, many of them belonged to the Roman Catholic Church and taught in the church, in the conviction that the scientific search for truth cannot possibly hurt the church. Nevertheless, some common elements can be found that were shared by most of the authors named in this context. Starting from secular historical research and the adoption of secular methodologies in their investigations of the sources of Christian faith (Bible, Church Fathers), scholars ended up making theological claims which ran counter to fundamental elements of neo-Thomist theology, e.g. the opinion that dogmas are not immutable. The element of the development of dogma slipped into the debate, and would provide a constant thread until it was ultimately accepted in the teachings of Vatican II.

Dogmatic formulas, it was stated much in line with the reasoning of the Catholic Tübingen School of the nineteenth century, are subject to contingency; and formulations or expressions of religious truth develop over time. The former is often a result of the influence of Hegelian and Kantian idealist philosophy. From these philosophers, the insights were borrowed that all knowledge, including knowledge of God, is ultimately limited to the confines of human capacities, which leads to a focus on the human aspect of knowledge and experience of the divine. Also, this leads to the philosophically founded detachment of the truth in itself, and the

[30] Pierre Battifol, 'Les études d'histoire ecclésiastique et les catholiques de France,' *La Quinzaine* 19 (1897), 185–205, there 185.

expression (e.g. the Nicene Creed) of that truth. The former is immutable; the latter is contingent and subject to evolution.

On the opposite side of this perspective stands neo-Thomism's tendency to stress philosophical realism, in which expressions of truth are deemed fully adequate in their rendering of the truth, to the extent that both are identifiable.[31] This identification of truth and expression, departing from the assumption that words and their content are identical, for neo-Thomist theologians, warrants the claim that altering the expressions themselves implies a loss of the truth. Therefore, dogmatic formulas must be viewed as above criticism, for "if words that conveyed the treasure of faith were to be replaced by others, this would give rise to a dangerous doctrinal relativism."[32]

Such a fear of relativism, however, was strongly criticized in the 1903 volume entitled *Dogme et critique* by Édouard Le Roy.[33] Connected to it is the rigid distinction between the natural and the supernatural as proposed by the First Vatican Council's Constitution *Dei filius*. Now, the theological horizon of Vatican I was no longer fully shared; and when investigating their sources, the modernists tended to stress the importance of immanence rather than transcendence. Their model of argumentation was not a logical and deductive model, rather an inductive and a source based one, starting from the collection and study of sources, of ancient languages, rather than departing from pre-given revealed and unchangeable truth formulas. This can be connected with the distinction made by John Henry Newman between notional (inference) and real (experience based) comprehension. Almost all of the authors accused of being modernists, promoted the historical critical method, and therefore defended the integration of historical thinking in theology. This was greatly stressed, for example, in the exegetical work of Albert Houtin.[34] As a result of all of this, some authors drew conclusions on the

---

[31] *Catholicism Contending with Modernity: Roman Catholic Modernism and Anti-Modernism in Historical Context*, ed. Darrell Jodock (Cambridge, 2000); Gabriel Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence: A Study in Catholic Modernism and Integralism* (Oxford, 1980); *Antimodernismus und Modernismus in der katholischen Kirche: Beiträge zur theologiegeschichtlichen Vorfeld des II. Vatikanums*, ed. Hubert Wolf [Programm und Wirkungsgeschichte des II. Vatikanums 2] (Paderborn, Munich, Vienna and Zürich, 1998).

[32] Paul Van Geest, *The Incomprehensibility of God: Augustine as A Negative Theologian* [Late Antiquity History and Religion 4] (Louvain, 2011), p. 158.

[33] Édouard Le Roy, *Dogme et critique* [Études de philosophie et de critique religieuse] (Paris, 1907).

[34] Houtin wrote *La question biblique chez les catholiques de France au XIX siècle* (Paris, 1902).

aforementioned threefold principle proposed by Leo XIII. The notions of God as primary author, of divine inspiration, and of scriptural inerrancy were relativized, if not denied.

4.1. *Some Protagonists of Modernism*

In his attempt to describe the modernist crisis, Thomas Michael Loome speaks about "a single intellectual *crisis* manifest in a wide variety of individual *controversies.*"[35] From that perspective, it is clear that we will need to analyse several so-called modernist thinkers, so as to avoid reducing Modernism to merely one of its protagonists.

Undoubtedly the most famous—or perhaps infamous—exponent of Modernism was Alfred Loisy. He had taught at the *Institut catholique de Paris*, and published important studies in the field of biblical exegesis, on occasion in reaction to the studies of the liberal Protestant scholar Adolf von Harnack. Loisy's research led him to deny divine authorship of Scripture, and thus to question the notion of inerrancy and inspiration. Ultimately, his two "red books" entitled *L'Évangile et l'église*, and *Autour d'un petit livre* were put on the Index of Prohibited Books and the Congregation of the Holy Office opened an investigation of his writings.[36] On March 7, 1908—the feast day of St Thomas—Loisy was officially excommunicated. One cannot underestimate his importance, although Loisy still remains an enigma: though in the earliest years of the century he had already claimed he no longer believed in God, he later insisted that his gravestone mention his being a priest. In any case, the "first version" of what was considered Modernism was called "Loisysme."[37]

Not everybody, however, who was "modern" was considered a modernist. The Dominican biblical scholar Marie-Joseph Lagrange wrote his 1903 book *La méthode historique*, in which he tried to develop a biblical studies

---

[35] Thomas Michael Loome, *Liberal Catholicism, Reform Catholicism, Modernism: A Contribution to a New Method in Modernist Research* [Tübinger theologische Studien 14] (Grunewald and Mainz, 1979), p. 195.

[36] Alfred Loisy, *L'Évangile et l'église* (Paris, 1902); idem, *Autour d'un petit livre* (Paris, 1903). On the occasion of the centenary of the book a conference volume was published under the title *Alfred Loisy cent ans après: Autour d'un petit livre*, ed. François Laplanche, Ilaria Biagioli, and Claude Langlois [Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes etudes: Sciences religieuses 131] (Turnhout, 2007). See also *La censure d'Alfred Loisy, 1903: Les documents des congrégations de l'Index et du Saint Office*, ed. Claus Arnold and Giacomo Losito [Fontes archivi sancti officii romani 4] (Vatican City, 2009).

[37] The term "Loisysme" was launched in 1903 by Hippolyte Gayraud, *Le Loisysme*, in *L'Univers*, 16 November 1903. Cf. Alfred Loisy, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire religieuse de notre temps*, Vol. 2 (Paris, 1931), p. 266.

middle ground, safeguarding the principles exposed by Leo XIII, yet all the while promoting the integration of an historical critical methodology in biblical research.[38] Lagrange, like Loisy, had a thorough knowledge of ancient languages (Greek, Aramaic, Hebrew, Syriac), a vast insight into the cultural habits and context of the Old Testament world, and much experience in the field of archaeology.[39] He had studied in France and in Vienna, and finally on November 15, 1890, he had founded the *École Biblique de Jérusalem*, in Jerusalem itself. There he would educate generations of biblical scholars in field work, but at the same time in the development of a biblical exegesis rooted in tradition but open to the insights and results of scientific inquiry. Lagrange was attacked on several occasions yet never officially condemned by Rome. He refrained from denying God's authorship and divine inspiration, yet developed—contrary to the neo-Thomist instrumentalist view of the human authors, about which he, a Dominican, was fully familiar—a theory in which the accent lay on cooperation between God and the human (historical) authors integrating the "immanent" and the "transcendent" perspective.

Before accentuating the anti-modernist side of the crisis, we wish to clarify that initially the modernist movement was not a movement as such. In reaction to the attacks from the anti-modernist side, however, it entered into a phase were those being attacked sought contact and created networks of their own, informing their peers of the actions of their opponents. Close to France, some Belgian exegetes such as Albin Van Hoonacker and Paulin Ladeuze were under suspicion, yet never saw their writings placed on the Index of Prohibited Books, thanks to the protection of Belgian Cardinal Mercier. Nevertheless, a Dutch student of Van Hoonacker, Henri Andreas Poels, did get accused and had to give up his professorship at the Catholic University of America, in Washington DC. Poels had written an article in which he asserted that Moses could not possibly have been the author of the Pentateuch.

In particular, after the condemnation of Loisy, one notices an internationalization of the modernist current. For instance, in England, Joseph Turmel would also be attacked and excommunicated in 1930. Other

---

[38] Marie-Joseph Lagrange, *La méthode historique* (Paris, 1903; reprinted as 31st issue of the series "Foi vivante" in 1966).

[39] Cf. Bernard Montagnes, *Le père Lagrange, 1855–1938: L'exégèse catholique dans la crise moderniste* [Histoire] (Paris, 1995); idem, *Marie-Joseph Lagrange: Une biographie critique* [Histoire—Biographie] (Paris, 2004); idem, 'Marie-Joseph Lagrange: Un bibliste à l'époque du modernisme,' in *Dominicains, théologiens et historiens: Las Casas et les noirs: Les correspondants du P. de Menasce* [Mémoire dominicaine 20] (Paris, 2007), pp. 123–46.

protagonists in Great Britain were Maude Petre and George Tyrrell. Petre, a progressive-minded English member of the society of the Daughters of the Heart of Mary, and the Jesuit priest Tyrrell protected each other and stayed in close contact.[40] Her book on the modernist movement (published in 1918 but completed already in 1914), was one of the earliest analyses of the modernist movement.[41] In Italy, theologians such as Salvatore Minocchi, Giovanni Semeria and Ernesto Buonaiuti came under suspicion as well.

The discussion on the nature of Sacred Scripture, its inspiration and the authorship of its books, in this first decade of the twentieth century was also also carried on by others; and it had a strong philosophical-methodological component. Maurice Blondel, for instance, who's writings reveal the complexity of his position over against Loisy, wrote in 1904 that the approaches of both *extrinsécisme* and *historicisme* entailed a unilateral form of exegesis. Each was one-sided and had its own implications. When one takes an *extrinsecist* approach Scripture becomes bound by belief that is disconnected from history; and supernatural truth lies beyond human reach. Exegesis then becomes ahistorical, divine and therefore not human. Blondel called *extrinsécisme* a "living monster";[42] and he saw *historicisme*, on the other hand taking a too positivist approach to Scripture: so bound to an historical-critical method, it could not go "deeper" than historic realities cut off from the "transcendental input" of the text.[43] Inspiration and divine authorship within *historicisme* become empty words. Blondel wanted to bridge the gap, or perhaps better said, move beyond it with an "overal view" of everything (including Scripture) in which profane history makes way for salvation history and makes a new link between faith and history.

In addition to biblical study, systematic theology became another battleground area in the modernist crisis. Ultimately the question moved from inspiration and the nature of Scripture to the nature of divine revelation. For the church, the Bible as well as dogmas are grounded in revelation, with Christ at the center. The modernists therefore were touching on the

---

[40] David G. Schultenover, *George Tyrrell: In Search of Catholicism* (Shepherdstown, 1981).

[41] Maude D. Petre, *Modernism: Its Failure and Its Fruits* (London and Edinburgh, 1918).

[42] See Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique dans la crise moderniste*, p. 567.

[43] Maurice Blondel, *Histoire et dogme: Les lacunes philosophiques de l'exégèse modern. Extrait de "La Quinzaine" des 1 et 16 février 1904* (La Chapelle-Montligeon, 1904), p. 19: (…) l'histoire technique et critique, au sens précis et scientifique du mot n'est pas l'histoire réelle.

very foundation of truth. Truth which traditionally—in the neo-scholastic perspective—was described as *adaequatio rei et intellectus*, was seen by the so-called modernists as an agreement between the intellect and life, founded on and starting from the concrete experience. Truth was thus seen as a dynamic concept, something alive, constantly in the making, a process that is never completed and therefore always relative. Maurice Blondel, who shocked some of the Sorbonne professors holding rather positivist stances, in 1893 with his book *L'Action*, suggested that relativity is a logical consequence of the act that is still in progress, since truth according to him is located in the action.[44] This is a striking illustration of his "method of immanence," in which transcendence is postulated and conceptualized out of life experience. Dogmas must also be included in the dynamics of history and are therefore relative.[45] Blondel was alert to the problem of making dogmas too human. Nevertheless the title of a collection of his articles, appearing ten years after *L'Action* in the periodical *La Quinzaine* was significantly titled *Histoire et dogme*. Blondel was looking for a scientific, rational way between the two, a *via media*. On the one hand, dogmas for Blondel are inconceivable without faith, which in turn is the actually lived religious experience within our historical *Sitz im Leben* in the church as a community (collective religious experience) and as an institution (the magisterium legitimizes experiences and proclaims the formulations thereof). On the other hand, in religious experience—thus in history—issues are experienced that the church has explicitly conceptualized and one could say "dogmatized." Blondel's student, Lucien Laberthonnière, developed this further in his own approach.[46]

Another prominent voice was that of Édouard Le Roy. Le Roy said that dogma as religious truth did not belong to the order of speculative reason and truth. It is rather a vital truth (a dynamic concept of truth, where "being" and "knowing" are connected.) A year after the book by Blondel, Le Roy wrote a bold article in *La Quinzaine* titled "Qu'est-ce qu'un dogme?"[47] And a year later—by way of a "right answer" to a critique of Le Roy's article by Léonce de Grandmaison—an article appeared under the same title in *Bulletin de Littérature ecclésiastique*.[48] Eventually in 1907 he published *Dogme et*

---

[44] Blondel, *Histoire et dogme*, pp. 55–8.
[45] Maurice Blondel, 'De la valeur historique du dogme,' *BLE* 8 (1905), 61–77.
[46] Cf. Lucien Laberthonnière, 'Dogme et théologie,' in *APhC* 69 (1908), 479–521.
[47] Édouard Le Roy, 'Qu'est-ce qu'un dogme?,' *La Quinzaine* (16 april 1905).
[48] Édouard Le Roy, 'Qu'est-ce qu'un dogme?,' *BLE* 8 (1906), 3–20. The article reacted to another contribution, written by Léonce de Grandmaison, 'Qu'est ce qu'un dogme?,' *BLE* 7 (1905), 187–221.

critique in response to the flow of comments his article had brought about. It was immediately placed on the Index of Prohibited Books. It went farther into the theory of immanence,[49] arguing that revelation, which by nature is transcendent, can, because it is contained in the human, only be "experienced" by humans as part of religious experience. Thus, revealed truth becomes accessible through an immanent approach. Thus, more clearly even than in Blondel, revelation is brought into history.

4.2. *Anti-Modernism and Its Strategies*

Whereas the modernists were often individual scholars, and often suffered from the disadvantages of their lacking hierarchical support, anti-modernism was in the exactly opposite situation. The reactions against Modernism, a movement defined by its opponents, were carried out on both official and unofficial levels.

On the unofficial level, we should stress the role of intransigent theologians. These theologians were exponents of the neo-Thomistic school and vehemently defended the scientific paradigm promoted by church leadership. Therefore, they proposed a type of theology that was strictly linked to and in defense of the doctrines laid out by the pope and the Roman curia's dicasteries. Theology in this sense was so strongly aligned with the magisterium's positions, that it has been dubbed "*magisteriumism*" by some scholars, implying that the ancient tradition of the *magisterium doctorum* (magisterium of the theologians) as a separate and legitimate form of magisterium within Catholicism was lost. In this sense, these theologians too represented a novelty within Catholic tradition. One of the most notable, yet hardly studied, exponents of this current is the biblical scholar Alphonse J. Delattre. In a series of pamphlets aimed directly against Lagrange,[50] Delattre, a Belgian Jesuit, attacked Van Hoonacker, Poels and Paulin Ladeuze,[51] and any type of exegesis that did not start out as a defense of Catholic orthodoxy. Delattre himself had also studied in the field, and was capable of reading the ancient languages; but he saw

[49] Édouard Le Roy, *Dogme et critique* (Paris, 1907).

[50] His most influential pamphlet in this context was undoubtedly Alphonse J. Delattre, *Autour de la Question biblique: Une nouvelle école d'exégèse et les autorités qu'elle invoque* (Liège, 1904).

[51] Luc Courtois, 'Aux origines de la crise moderniste en Belgique: Une dénonciation anonyme de l'exégète Paulin Ladeuze (février 1903),' in *The Quintessence of Lives: Intellectual Biographies in the Low Countries presented to Jan Roegiers*, ed. Dries Vanysacker et al. [BRHE 91] (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 485–503.

the study of the sources as secondary and as a means of searching for historical arguments to support the doctrines of the church rather than to relativize them. Along the same line of thought, Delatttre continuously attacked Americanism,[52] Harnackism, Loisyism, Modernism, Socialism, etc., and sought to expose its defenders via his own writings.

Other prominent figures in this current were Umberto Benigni, who in 1909 founded—with the support of Pius X—the so-called *Sodalitium Pianum*, known in France as *La Sapinière*.[53] The *Sodalitium*, or "brotherhood of Pius" constituted a secret international network of Catholic "integrists," with as its aim tracking and exposing "modernists." The fact that such a secret network was supported by the Catholic hierarchy, added to the fact that the modernist crisis promoted a climate of fear and suppression within the Catholic world; and it drove many Catholic intellectuals away from the church, certainly the counter-effect of what Pope Leo XIII had tried to obtain with his brand of centralization policies.

This brings us to the official sanctioning of Modernism, which touched upon the basic elements of Catholic faith. From the side of the Roman Catholic magisterium, this was unacceptable, and an anti-dote had to be developed. At this juncture, any attempt at undermining neo-scholasticism was not much appreciated and led to reactions from the pope, as well as from the Congregation of the Holy Office.

Attempting to offer a survey of the most important anti-modernist reactions, we point out five elements. First, many publications of scholars were put on the Index of Prohibited Books, not seldom under the influence of members of *La Sapinière*. In some cases, as for instance with a volume on the minor prophets, prepared by Van Hoonacker and attacked by Delattre, authors, in collaboration with their superiors, succeeded in blocking such attempts.[54] Second, Catholic scientists such as Alfred Loisy and Joseph Turmel were excommunicated. Next, papal documents openly attacked and condemned Modernism. In the case of the modernist crisis

[52] Alphonse J. Delattre, *Un catholicisme américain* (Namur, 1898).

[53] On Umberto Benigni and the "Sodalitium," see Otto Weiss, *Modernismus und Antimodernismus im Dominikanerorden: Zugleich ein Beitrage zu "Sodalitium Pianum"* [QSNT 2] (Regensburg, 1998); Lorenzo Bedeschi, *L'antimodernismo in Italia: Accusatori, polemisti, fanatici* (Milan, 2000), pp. 46–53; Roger Aubert, 'Mgr. Benigni, un intégriste aux antécédents progressistes: Une interprétation nouvelle du "catholicisme integral",' *RTL* 8 (1977), 461–8. Also see Émile Poulat, *Intégrisme et catholicisme integral: Un réseau secret international moderniste, la Sapinière, 1909–1921* [Religion et sociétés] (Tournai, 1969).

[54] Frans Neirynck, 'A. van Hoonacker et l'Index,' *ETL* 57 (1981), 293–7.

one can easily speak of a "Document Storm,"[55] which started in 1907 with, on July 4, the promulgation by Pope Pius X of what has been dubbed "the minor syllabus," namely the decree entitled *Lamentabili sane exitu*, condemning 65 propositions as "modernist."[56] On September 8, 1907, this was followed by the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis*, openly condemning Modernism and urging Catholic scholars to stick with the neo-scholastic paradigm proposed by the Catholic hierarchy. A year later, in 1908, the *motu proprio Praestantia scripturae* was issued.[57] In later years, this would be continued, though in a more moderate fashion, with the encyclical *Spiritus paraclitus* promulgated by Benedict XV, on September 15, 1920.[58] All of these documents defended neo-Thomism, stressed a supra-historical approach to Scripture as a source of revelation, and reiterated the necessity of safeguarding the absolute inerrancy of Sacred Scripture. A fourth way of countering the influence of Modernism, announced in the Apostolic Letter *Vigilantiae* of October 30, 1902, was the establishment of a Pontifical Biblical Commission.[59] Established by Leo XIII, the commission would have, as its task, watching over Catholic biblical scholarship for decades to come. As of 1904 the commission was allowed to confer academic degrees, and as of 1911 all those wanting to obtain a canonical degree in Sacred Scripture (*i.e.* anyone who wanted to become a Catholic professor in biblical exegesis) was forced to take examinations set up by the Biblical Commission. Clearly the Pontifical Biblical Commission had been set up as a control apparatus and served as a watchdog over Catholic biblical scholarship. The Commission prepared numerous documents formulated in terms of questions and answers, treating subjects such as the *Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch* (1906), the *Authority and the Veracity of the Fourth Gospel* (1907); the *Historical Value of the First Chapters of the*

---

[55] To get a clear overview of the series of magisterial documents concerning biblical studies, see the *Enchiridion Biblicum: Documenti della Chiesa sulla Sacra Scrittura*, ed. Alfio Filippi and Erminio Lora [Strumenti] (Bologna, 1994²).

[56] Pius X, 'Lamentabili sane exitu (July 7, 1907),' *ASS* 40 (1907), 470–8. For a thorough introduction into the background, see *Lamentabili sane exitu: Les documents préparatoires du Saint-Office*, ed. Claus Arnold and Giacomo Losito [Fontes archive sanctii officii romani 6] (Vatican City, 2011).

[57] Pius X, 'Praestantia scripturae (November 18, 1907),' *ASS* 40 (1907), 723–6.

[58] Benedict XV, 'Spiritus paraclitus (September 15, 1920),' *AAS* 12 (1920), 385–422.

[59] Leo XIII, 'Vigilantiae studiique (October 30, 1902),' *ASS* 35 (1902–1903), 234–8. Concerning the Papal Biblical Commission and the development of biblical research see Joseph G. Prior, *The Historical Critical Method in Catholic Exegesis* [Tesi Gregoriana: Serie teologia 50] (Rome, 1999). Also see Albert Vanhoye, 'Passé et present de la Commission biblique,' *Gregorianum* 74 (1993), 261–75.

Book of Genesis (1909); the *Authorship and the Composition of the Psalms of David* (1910), etc.

Finally, there was the imposition of oaths on Catholic clergy. First, on July 29, 1910, Pius X imposed on all Catholic biblical scholars an oath of allegiance to Catholic doctrine and to the pope. This was soon—already on September 1, 1910 with the *motu proprio Sacrorum antistitum*—expanded.[60] Henceforth all Catholic members of clergy (secular and religious) were obliged to sign an anti-modernist oath, which clearly indicated that they refrained from any "rationalist" sympathies and would defend the Thomistic tradition of the Catholic Church.

[60] Pius X, 'Sacrorum antistitum' (September 1, 1910), *AAS* 2 (1910), 669–72. In 1967, during the pontificate of Paul VI, the oath was eliminated.

CHAPTER THREE

WORLD WAR ONE AND THE INTERBELLUM

1. *Benedict XV: A War-Time Pope*

The assassination on June 28, 1914 of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria, heir to the throne of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, sparked the outbreak of World War One in the summer of 1914. The war would bring an end to the empires that had existed since the nineteenth century: the German Empire, the Austrian Empire, and the Russian Empire. Since the nineteenth-century tensions had risen between the dual alliance set up by Bismarck (a political alliance between the German Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Empire) on the one hand, and the Russian tzarist Empire on the other hand, over the rule of the Balkan areas. At the same time Germany was entangled in an arms race with Great Britain. Also, since the French defeat in 1870 (which among others had led to the loss of Alsatian territories by the Germans) there was an ongoing conflict about the exact frontiers between France and Germany. Then, last but not least: Austro-Hungary had annexed territories belonging to the former Ottoman Empire (i.e. the region of Bosnia-Herzegovina) which had irritated the Russian Romanov tzarist Dynasty—being in favor of a pan-Slavic rule and in support of the Serbian people under Russian Orthodox influence. In 1912 and 1913 two Balkan wars followed and led to the further destabilization of the region, until the 1914 assassination of the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne set in motion a series of hostilities between reigning forces.

Against this backdrop, Pope Pius X died in September 1914, just as World War One had begun. The conclave urgently needed to decide who would become the next pope. Moreover, Pius X had made an end to the tradition of political interference in the conclaves, by calling a halt to the practice of national vetoes. The cardinals present were well aware of the climate of anxiety created under Pius X and his anti-modernist policies; and they were also keenly aware of the political importance of this papal election. As a consequence, they opted for a candidate who would demonstrate another approach than that of his predecessor, and who would likely continue the direction taken by Leo XIII. The cardinals elected Cardinal Giacomo della Chiesa, who chose the name of Benedict

XV. The entire pontificate of Benedict XV would be dominated by the first global conflict the modern world had experienced.[1]

The modern industrialized world brought new weaponry to the First World War: tanks, airplanes, submarines, and poisonous gas. At the same time, warfare was carried out in the nineteenth-century tradition, with outdated strategies and mass battles. The combination of these factors, and the multitude of political alliances and forces involved in the conflict led to massive casualties on all sides. In January 1917, U.S. forces entered the war scene, as a result of ongoing German aggression following the German sinking of the British liner RMS Lusitania in May 1915.

Then, in October 1917 the Russian Revolution broke out, ending the rule of the Tzars. Members of the Romanov Dynasty were assassinated and a Communist regime was installed in Russian ruled territories.[2] By the end of the war, countries like Belgium and the young state of Poland were devastated. The total number of military and civilian casualties in the First World War was over 37 million, making it one of the deadliest conflicts in human history. There were over twenty million wounded.

Soon after the end of World War I, in 1918, the Vatican would have to cope, yet again, with another kind of Europe, and with new national structures. New countries emerged or re-emerged such as Poland; the former Kingdom of Serbia was turned into a multinational state uniting Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (later Yugoslavia), while Finland, Estonia and Lithuania became independent states. The Austrian Empire dissolved into the separate states of Austria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; and the Ottoman Empire disappeared with its remaining territories now belonging to the state of Turkey. The end result would be the dissolution of the Middle East.

After the victory of the Allied Forces and the Armistice of November 11, 1918, a new world order was created with the Treaty of Versailles on June 28, 1919. The treaty blamed Germany for having originated the conflict and made it responsible for the social, psychological, and economic effects of World War I. Emperor Wilhelm II was charged with war crimes and a list of restrictions was imposed on the new state of Germany, which would seriously affect Germany's social and economic life. Article 231 of the Treaty, the so-called "War-Guilt clause" put all responsibility and accountability

---

[1] John Pollard, *The Unknown Pope: Benedict XV (1914–1922) and the Pursuit of Peace* (London, 1999).

[2] Cf. Philippe Chenaux, *L'église catholique et le communisme en Europe, 1917–1989: De Lénine à Jean-Paul II* [Histoire] (Paris, 2009).

on Germany for the damage done to the civilian populations of the Allied Forces. This economic accountability, combined with severe restrictions on German military forces, led to the subsequent impoverishment of the German population.

Throughout this conflict, Pope Benedict XV had been the supreme head of the Roman Catholic Church. He chose never to enter into open conflict with governmental administrations, rather to work via all diplomatic channels at his disposal.[3] He urged the different parties involved in the war to seek and promote peace, for instance by sending papal envoys to negotiate. He openly expressed his sadness regarding the war in the 1914 encyclical *Ad beatissimi apostolorum*, distressed about the end of civilized Europe.[4] In 1915 he sent Eugenio Pacelli to negotiate with the Austrian emperor Franz Joseph. And, in all circumstances he opted for Vatican impartiality. Holy See neutrality, however, did not have its intended effects. Germany and Austria-Hungary on the one hand, France and Great Britain, on the other, turned against the pope, accusing him of siding with the other party. Nevertheless, Benedict XV continued his policy; and in 1917, he proposed a peace treaty urging all parties involved to refrain from seeking damage compensations from the others at the end of the conflict.[5] This generated negative reactions from those countries which had suffered great losses from German and Austrian violence: France and Belgium.[6] On top of this, Germany underscored the perception by promising the pope that it would conquer the city of Rome and restore the pope's temporal powers, well aware of the fact that the *Roman Question* had still not been resolved.

All of this had, as its consequence, that Pope Benedict was not invited to the Versailles peace negotiations of 1919—although discrete talks were taking place on the side in the presence of an official from the Vatican State Secretariat, Bonaventura Cerretti.[7] Nevertheless, the exclusion of the Vatican from the official table of negotiations created a situation in which the Vatican could not claim any compensation for church losses during

[3] Gabriel Adrianyi et al., 'Die Weltkirche im 20. Jahrhundert,' in *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Hubert Jedin, Vol. 7 (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna, 1979; Sonderausgabe 1985).

[4] Benedict XV, 'Ad beatissimi apostolorum (November 1, 1914),' *AAS* 6 (1914), 565–581.

[5] Francis Latour, *Le Saint-Siège et les problèmes de la paix pendant la première Guerre Mondiale* (Paris and Montréal, 1996).

[6] Jan De Volder, *Benoît XV et la Belgique durant la grande Guerre* (Turnhout, 1996).

[7] Giuseppe M. Croce, 'Le Saint-Siège et la conference de la Paix, 1919: Diplomatie de l'église et diplomaties d'état,' *Mélanges de l'école française de Rome* 109 (1997), 793–823.

the war. In the same year, 1919, the League of Nations was founded by France, Britain, Italy, and Japan. Later Belgium, Brazil, Greece, and Spain joined. United States President, Woodrow Wilson, had enthusiastically promoted the idea of the League as a means of avoiding any repetition of another world war; and the League was the centerpiece of Wilson's "Fourteen Points for Peace." Nevertheless, despite Wilson's efforts to establish and promote the League, for which he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in October 1919, the United States did not join.

In this entirely new context of international alliances, Benedict XV continued his path of reconciliation, making use of his diplomatic corps of nuncios. By the end of his pontificate these ambassadors were represented in 27 countries, and even relations with the Italian State had improved. He also abolished Pope Pius IX's policy of prohibiting Catholic state leaders visiting the Italian government to also visit the Vatican, as well as prohibiting Italian Catholics from being politically active. All the while, Benedict XV was among the first popes to take the often harsh fate of the Eastern Catholic traditions seriously, which shows on several levels: in 1920 he made a strong international impression by reaching out to the state of children in need all over Central Europe in his encyclical *Annus iam plenus*.[8] Three years before he had decided to establish the new Congregation for the Oriental Church, and henceforth detached it from the *Propaganda Fide*, thus making clear that the "uniate" churches were an integral part of the Catholic Church.

2. *The Pope versus Totalitarian Politics*

In late early January 1922, Benedict XV contracted pneumonia and died, rather unexpectedly. Probably the least remembered pope of the twentieth century, Pope Benedict was succeeded by Cardinal Achille Ratti, who had spent much of his career as the head of the Vatican Libraries and was praised mostly as a scholar. In the last years before his election at the conclave, he had been active as a papal nuncio in Poland and Lithuania. He did not, however, have any comprehension of Slavic languages and turned out not to be the best possible candidate for such a diplomatic assignment. In Poland—one of the regions that suffered most from the Germans during World War I, Ratti had been regarded as a representative

[8] Benedict XV, 'Annus iam plenus (December 1, 1920),' *AAS* 12 (1920), 553–6.

of Benedict XV, who was still seen as the "pro-German Pope," and at the same time had been under attack from Communist forces since the 1917 October Revolution. The latter created Ratti's lifelong conviction that Communism was a threat to the general human wellbeing and could by no means be tolerated. Nevertheless, the Warsaw political administration put so much pressure on the Vatican that Ratti was ordered to leave his post and return to Rome.[9] He was then appointed Archbishop of Milan in 1921. Later, on various occasions, he would condemn both the Communist philosophical ideology as well as those adhering to Communism. In 1921, he was elevated to the cardinalate, and a year later, at the conclave, he was the middle ground candidate between Cardinals Gasparri and Pietro la Fontaine.

The pontificate of Pius XI would span the entire interbellum period and would be an important period for the Catholic Church's political positioning, raising broad societal and political reactions.[10] In this respect, Pope Pius XI continued much of the policy that had been set out by Benedict XV: he would be the first pope since 1870 to restore the traditional annual *Urbi et orbi* papal blessing over the City of Rome and the world. But much more importantly, under his pontificate a list of concordats with the new nation states emerging out of the World War would be signed, which led to a broadened and complex network of bilateral relationships. Concordats were signed with Lithuania (1922), with Poland (1925), with Austria (1933), and with Yugoslavia (1935).[11]

In 1933, Pope Pius XI agreed to a concordat with Nazi-Germany, arranged by the former nuncio there, Eugenio Pacelli, who had been appointed Vatican State Secretary as of 1930. From the start, the Vatican's attitude toward the Nazi Regime was double-pronged: similar to the sentiments of other governments, it sympathized with Germany's being a buffer state between the Soviet Union governed by an atheist regime; but, at the same time, the Vatican carefully watched Germany's political and military evolution.[12]

---

[9] HansJakob Stehle, *Die Ostpolitik des Vatikans, 1917–1975* (Munich and Zurich, 1975).

[10] Cf. Marc Agostino, *Le pape Pie XI et l'opinion, 1922–1939* (Rome, 1991).

[11] On the side, it should be said that precisely this pontificate—partially relying on the curial reform of Pius X—created an internationalization of the Roman Curia, putting more and more non-Italians in influential positions. This tendency, as was recently demonstrated, would be curtailed by Pius XII, who re-italianized the Roman Curia. See the note published by Étienne Fouilloux, 'Réformer la curie romaine?,' *CrSt* 33 (2012), 875–90.

[12] See the important book by Hubert Wolf, *Pope and Devil: The Vatican's Archives and the Third Reich* (Cambridge, 2010).

In 1933, Adolf Hitler and his National Socialist German Workers Party assumed power, making Hitler the new German Chancellor succeeding Paul von Hindenburg. Hitler's political party would openly defy the Versailles Treaty, calling it a Jewish-Marxist complot against the German people. At the time, Vatican Secretary of State, Pacelli, was extremely familiar with the German situation and understood the effects of the Treaty of Versailles—not much appreciated in certain Vatican circles either—on the German economic and military situation. The impact of the Treaty of Versailles had been devastating and now fueled the growing success of the Nazi party by creating economic growth through large infrastructure rebuilding and increased military development. On top of this, Germany organized the 1936 Olympic Games, seizing the occasion to show off its new wealth and even its military power. At the same time, oppression of minorities grew rapidly in Germany; and political parties other than the Nazi party were, one by one, forced to dissolve. By the end of his pontificate, Pius XI had become quite aware of the rise of anti-Semitism and the spread of racist theories, which had also been adopted in Italy, under the fascist rule of Benito Mussolini.[13]

In 1937 Pius XI's concern led to the publication of the encyclical *Mit Brennender Sorge*, which openly disapproved of the Nazi ideology.[14] The encyclical was forbidden by the Nazi administration, and many Catholics were imprisoned as a result of their secretly spreading copies of it. It should be noted that the encyclical was but the tip of the iceberg: in the years between 1933 and 1936 Pius XI had sent over thirty letters of protest to the leaders of the Third Reich. Still, in the last year of his pontificate, in April 1938, he had the Congregation for the Universities and Seminaries prepare a *Syllabus Against Racist Theories* to be distributed among all Catholic educational institutions. The document was never released.[15] During the last months of his life, Pius XI had been drafting an encyclical on the unity of the human race, again attacking racist theories; but the encyclical was never promulgated due to his death.

---

[13] The rise of fascism in Italy already goes back to the last years of the pontificate of Benedict XV, and already at the time, Vatican circles were taking a careful distance. In this regard, see Alberto Guasco, L'avvento dal fascismo e le prime reazioni Vaticane 1921–1922,' *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia* 66 (2012), 97–113.

[14] Pius XI, 'Mit brennender Sorge (March 14, 1937),' *AAS* 29 (1937), 145–67. For an elaborate study of Pius XI and his attitude over against fascist regimes, see Emma Fattorini's book *Pio XI, Hitler e Mussolini: La solitudine di un papa* (Turin, 2007).

[15] Hubert Wolf, *Pope and Devil*, p. 283.

In Italy too, Pope Pius XI had expressed his concerns about Fascism and once again a double-pronged attitude is seen: the Vatican benefited from a new pact with the Italian State led by Benito Mussolini. The concordat, signed on February 2, was ratified on June 7, 1929 is known as the Lateran Treaties. These were the result of three years of negotiating with the Italian government, and led to the final settling of the *Roman Question*. Italy agreed to offer independence to the Vatican State, and the grounds of Vatican City were now officially handed over to the pope. By the Lateran treaties, the Italian Catholic Church regained possession of lost ecclesiastical properties, such as schools and hospitals. Canon Law was acknowledged as the church's proper legislation and the Italian State offered a large financial compensation for the losses of the pope as former leader of the Papal States. The Lateran Treaties also theoretically granted the Catholic Church supreme authority over Catholic education in all Italian schools, including state schools. On the other hand, Mussolini had demanded that the church cease its support for the Italian Catholic political party, the *Partito Popolare*. Pope Pius XI had agreed to this, with the result that Mussolini lost all serious political opposition within Italy and Fascism gained new strength in the Italian State. Moreover, Mussolini rapidly dissolved several Catholic youth movements, forcing young Catholics into the Fascist youth movements.[16] Two years later Pius XI would react strongly against this move in his encyclical of 1931, *Non abbiamo bisogno*.[17]

In close cooperation with his Secretary of State, Pope Pius XI would have to deal with two totalitarian regimes at once: the aforementioned Fascist government as well as the Communist rule of the Soviet Union. In Communist territories both Roman Catholic and Eastern Catholics were faced with severe suppression. Given the fact that the Vatican lost its control over its bishops and priests, who were actively persecuted and exiled, and the fact that Communist leaders forced Greek Catholics to convert to Russian Orthodoxy, while they controlled the Russian Orthodox Church, the Vatican tended to see Communism as a more serious threat to the church than Fascism. In the 1920s Pacelli carried on secret conversations with the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs but they ceased in 1927. Nevertheless, persecutions did not end.

---

[16] On the clash between the Vatican and the Italian fascist regime, see the recent volume by Piero Pennacchini, *La Santa Sede e il fascismo in conflitto per l'Azione Cattolica* (Vatican City, 2012).

[17] Pius XI, 'Non Abbiamo Bisogno (June 29, 1931),' *AAS* 23 (1931), 285–312.

3. *Catholic Theology during the Interbellum*

The pontificate of Benedict XV was to such a degree filled with the political and diplomatic problems raised by the First World War that much less happened in the field of theological developments. The modernist crisis waned, also because of the fact that less scholarly work could be carried out and that archaeological research activities in the Near East had come to a halt. In 1921, this Pope did not heed the call to re-establish the *Sodalitium pianum*, which had dissolved itself at the beginning of the War. The 1914 encyclical *Ad beatissimi apostolorum* had already pre-figured the pope's distancing from the integrist fractions in Roman Catholicism, as it had called "to bring to an end the dissent and discord among Catholics." This caused a less restricted atmosphere for biblical scholars.[18] One of the more important moments which led to a certain *détente* with the French was Benedict XV's canonization of the French woman soldier, Jeanne d'Arc, with solemn celebrations attended by many French politicians. Another significant element was the expansion of Catholic missions after the War, to which he devoted great attention. In his 1919 encyclical *Maximum illud*, while deploring the existence of the "numberless heathen" in the world, he devoted himself to the problems of the missionaries and promoted establishing an indigenous clergy, much in line with what had been proposed during the First Vatican Council.[19] The missionary issue was immediately picked up more intensely by his successor, Pius XI. Pius strengthened the importance of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, known as the *Propaganda Fide*, which had developed into an influential dicastery under the leadership of Cardinal Willem-Marinus Van Rossum[20]—whose prominent voice had echoed throughout the 1919 encyclical.[21] Many indigenous priests were made bishops, which led to greater internationalization and internal diversity within the Catholic world episcopate. This would have its effect on the presence of bishops from all parts of the world, later on, during Vatican II.

---

[18] See Poulat, *Intégrisme et catholicisme intégral*, p. 600, underlines that the document was meant as a warning against the integrist fractions no longer to stir the polemics.

[19] Benedict XV, 'Maximum illud (November 30, 1919),' *AAS* 11 (1919), 440–55.

[20] On Willem-Marinus Van Rossum, see Claude Prudhomme, 'Le Cardinal Van Rossum et la politique missionnaire du Saint-Siège sous Benoît XV et Pie XI, 1918–1932,' in *Life with a Mission: Cardinal Willem Marinus van Rossum CSsR, 1854–1932*, ed. Vefie Poels, Theo Salemink, Hans de Valk (Gent, 2011), pp. 123–41.

[21] *Histoire du christianisme*, ed. Jean-Marie Mayeur (Paris, 1990), 12:16–7.

When, in 1922, Pius XI became the head of the Catholic Church, his choice of name had raised expectations of a revived anti-modernist papal agenda. This however, was not entirely the case. Due to the fact that Pius XI had high esteem for scientific progress, he did not openly attack Modernism along the lines of Pius X. He opted rather for a reinforced papal support for neo-Thomism, expressed in his 1923 encyclical *Studiorum ducem*.[22] He supported the progress of science, but at the same time made clear that the Catholic Church's official "paradigm" in these matters was and remained the neo-scholastic paradigm, which would prevail in pontifical universities and Catholic seminaries worldwide. This, however, did not imply that the new pope would refrain from blocking currents and movements under suspicion by the hierarchy.

One particular case here is involved the movement in Francophone Europe—especially France and the southern half of Belgium—that went under the title of *Action française*. The so-called "French Action" became a major movement,[23] which had developed around the turn of the century in connection with the Dreyfus affair and was strongly promoted by Charles Maurras. Maurras, the principal ideologist for *Action Française*, used his influence to shape the *Action Française* as monarchist, counter-revolutionary (objecting to the legacy of the French Revolution) and anti-democratic. It supported integral nationalism and Catholicism in order to constitute a socially cohesive French society.[24] In 1926 Pope Pius XI condemned *Action Française* and Louis Billot was removed from the college of cardinals due to his clear sympathies with *Action Française.* In the aftermath, this raised serious discussions among French intellectuals, such as Jacques Maritain—approving of the decision—and Henri de Lubac, in order to seek a proper understanding of the papal position.[25]

In 1936, Pius XI established the Pontifical Academy of Sciences to present a church initiative to counteract an over-secularized world. The issue of secularization, rising strongly after the First World War, greatly

---

[22] Pius XI, 'Studiorum ducem (June 29, 1923),' *AAS* 15 (1923), 309–26.

[23] Nicolas Fontaine [Louis Canet], *Saint-Siège, "Action française" et Catholiques intégraux* (Paris, 1928).

[24] Jacques Prévotat, *Les catholiques et l'Action française: Histoire d'une condamnation, 1899–1939* (Paris, 2001).

[25] Jacques Maritain, 'Une opinion sur Charles Maurras et le devoir des Catholiques,' in Jacques and Raïssa Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes* (Fribourg, 1984), 3:739–80. For Henri de Lubac's criticism of Maritain's legitimizing of the pope's interventions, see Henri de Lubac, 'Le pouvoir de l'église en matière temporelle,' *Revue de Sciences Religieuses* 12 (1932), 329–54.

concerned Pius XI and had already led him to publish his 1925 encyclical *Quas primas*, declaring Christ as the "King of the Universe."[26] To some extent, this Christocentric turn in magisterial discourse would prove valuable for the evolution of Catholic theology in decades to come, and in particular for paving the way for Vatican II.[27] In this regard, one cannot leave unmentioned the fact that both Pius XI and his successor already planned to organize a new council.[28]

Before entering the pontificate of Pius XII and dealing with the preconciliar movements of renewal within Catholicism in our next part, we wish to close this chapter by offering a brief survey of some of the most important theological developments in the interbellum.[29] First, one notices a continued distrust of anything that presents itself as novelty. At least implicitly, an anti-modernist attitude continues to linger, and renewal attempts are more than often not supported by a hierarchy, still intent on promoting the neo-scholastic theological paradigm.

Next, notwithstanding the first point, some evolution in ecclesiology was recognized and acknowledged. From Vatican I until 1920 the emphasis had been on the institutional and canonical aspects of the church and its pyramid structure with the pope as its supreme head. Now, slowly, the focus began to shift. Attention was increasingly paid to the inner, spiritual, counterpart of the hierarchically structured church, and to the early rise of an ecclesiology of the People of God on pilgrimage. Authors like Romano Guardini played a crucial role in this development, particularly with his 1922 volume *Vom Sinn der Kirche*.[30]

Third, the shift towards a deepened spiritual understanding of the church's nature was often connected with a Christ-centered spirituality. Important promoters of this Christocentric spirituality were Benedictines such as the Irish born Dom Columba Marmion, the Benedictine abbot of Maredsous, Belgium. Marmion published most of his works in French, and they were later translated into English by Sister Mary Saint Thomas.

---

[26] Pius XI, 'Quas primas (December 11, 1925),' *AAS* 17 (1925), 604–605.

[27] Marie-Thérèse Desouche, *Le Christ dans l'histoire selon le pape Pie XI: Un prélude à Vatican II?* [Cogitatio fidei 265] (Paris, 2008).

[28] François-Charles Uginet, 'Les projets de concile général sous Pie XI et Pie XII,' in (*Le Deuxième concile du Vatican, 1959–1965*), ed. École française de Rome (Rome, 1989), pp. 65–78.

[29] For a broader sketch of theological evolutions, see a.o. Christoph Theobald, 'De Vatican I aux années 1950,' in *Histoire des dogmes*, ed. Bernard Sesboüé and Christoph Theobald (Paris, 1996), 4:471–510.

[30] Romano Guardini, *Vom Sinn der Kirche: Fünf Vorträge* (Mainz, 1922).

Books of central importance are his *Le Christ, vie de l'âme; Le Christ dans ses mystères*; and *Le Christ idéal du moine*.[31]

Fourth, the combination of the abovementioned factors led to the promotion of a vision of the church as the Mystical Body of Christ. Such an ecclesiology was not new, and had already been present at Vatican I; but given that the council's initial ecclesiological outline never made it into the constitution, official promotion had faltered. Now it was developed as the spiritual flipside of Vatican I's papal-centralist ecclesiology. The "Mystical-Body-ecclesiology" was strongly developed in the thought of authors like Émile Mersch,[32] and would ultimately be included in the 1943 encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*.[33] Mersch also developed the moral theological aspect of his ecclesiology, with ethics centered on a theology of the Body of Christ.

Finally, in the same period, within Catholicism, and often at the level of basic Catholicism or in monastic circles, movements of renewal were spreading; and many of them would flourish under the next pontificate, that of Pius XII,[34] thus again laying foundations for the Second Vatican Council: The biblical movement, the liturgical movement, the ecumenical movement, and the *nouvelle théologie*. Each of these movements can, to some extent, be regarded as a "*Ressourcement*" movement,[35] seeking inspiration and models in the early church, as the basis for contemporary reform. In this way, once again, theologians began developing an alternative to neo-scholasticism.[36] The latter point will be elaborated further in the next chapter.

---

[31] Columba Marmion, *Le Christ, vie de l'âme* (Maredsous, 1914). This date appeared on the title page because the real date, 1917, would have been problematic with the German occupier; Marmion, *Le Christ dans ses mystères* (Maredsous, 1919); Marmion, *Le Christ, idéal du moine: Conférences spirituelles sur la vie monastique et religieuse* (Maredsous, 1922).

[32] Émile Mersch, *Le Corps mystique du Christ: Étude de théologie historique* [Museum lessianum: Section théologique 28–9], 2 Vols. (Louvain, 1933).

[33] Pius XII, 'Mystici Corporis Christi (June 29, 1943),' *AAS* 35 (1943), 200–43.

[34] See *L'eredità del magisterio di Pio XII*, ed. Philippe Chenaux (Rome, 2010).

[35] *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology*, ed. Gabriel Flynn and Paul D. Murray (Oxford, 2012).

[36] Cf. Roger Aubert, 'Le demi-siècle qui a préparé Vatican II,' in *Nouvelle histoire de l'église*, ed. Roger Aubert et al. (Paris, 1975), 5:583–689.

CHAPTER FOUR

RENEWAL AND CONDEMNATION

1. *Pius XII: A New Dawn*

The years ranging from 1935 to 1959 constitute the period that immediately preceded the Second Vatican Council. Many of the issues raised and developed during that council can only be fully understood against the background of this period. However, historically seen, the developments that occurred from 1935 onward deserve attention in their own right, and not merely as a prelude to Vatican II. In fact, precisely in this era the full impact of Vatican I was felt at various church levels. In a first section, we consider the church historical developments, the period substantially coinciding with the duration of the pontificate of Pope Pius XII (1939–58). In a second part, we look at the various theological movements that emerged during this period.

Before presenting a few central elements of the pontificate of Pope Pius XII, we briefly discuss the pre-papal career of Eugenio Pacelli. We cannot but begin, however, with his election as pope.[1] After the death of Pius XI in February 1939, the conclave gathered to elect a new pope. A multitude of factors played a role, and for certain, the need was expressed to have a skilled diplomat as the future pope, needed against the world political background on the eve of the Second World War. On March 2 of that year Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli—with but a minor challenge from other cardinals such as Luigi Maglione and Elia Angelo Dalla Costa—turned out to be the major candidate.[2] After three ballots, the choice went to Eugenio Pacelli, who, neglecting the proposition to adopt the name Eugenius, would take the name of Pius XII, as a clear expression of gratitude for Pius XI, who had strongly supported Pacelli as a possible successor. The

[1] On Pope Pius XII, see, among others, the excellent biography by Philippe Chenaux, *Pie XII: Diplomate et Pasteur* [Histoire—Biographie] (Paris, 2003); Andrea Tornielli, *Pio XII: Eugenio Pacelli: Un uomo sul trono di Pietro*, (Milan, 2007); Margherita Marchione, *Pope Pius XII: History and Hagiography* (Vatican City, 2010).

[2] On this conclave, see the notes found in the diary of Cardinal Baudrillart, *Les carnets du cardinal Baudrillart, 1935–1939*, ed. Paul Christophe [L'histoire à vif] (Paris, 1996), there pp. 973–7. Baudrillart noted without reservations that "dès le début le card. Pacelli prend une grande avance."

reign of Pius XII would be a long pontificate and would only end in 1958, spanning World War Two and the first decade of the Cold War. Up until the present day, this pontificate has raised debate and even controversy, most of it surrounding the (non-)actions of Pius XII on behalf of Jewish people during the Second World War.[3] The fact that the sections in the Vatican archives for the era of Pius XII, in this regard, have only been opened partially, simply adds more fuel to the fires of this controversy. In many studies on Pius XII, the authors tend to limit all attention to the "Jewish Problem" and read the entire pontificate—and occasionally his entire life—through this single perspective. Such a unilateral approach, as proposed for instance in John Cornwell's book *Hitler's Pope*, holds risks of its own.

In order to understand the role played by Pius XII, one must take into account his earlier career. At the age of 27, in 1903, Pacelli was appointed as a *minutante* at the Holy See's Secretariat of State. That appointment would be the first step in a long diplomatic career under the reigns of several Popes. From the next year onward, he would assist Cardinal Gasparri in his codification of Canon Law, within the Congregation for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, of which he would become the secretary in 1914. Therefore, already during World War One, Pacelli had became thoroughly acquainted with Vatican diplomacy and gained the confidence of Benedict XV. The latter would serve as Pius XII's model for the role of the Roman Pontiff in a situation of global crisis and war. It is Benedict XV who sent Pacelli on a peace mission to negotiate with the Austrian emperor in 1915; and in 1917 he had appointed Pacelli as nuncio in Munich, in Bavaria. In this diplomatic post, Pacelli was responsible both for the entire German speaking region during the war and conveyed the pope's peace suggestions to the German emperor Wilhelm II. He witnessed first hand, after 1918, the devastating effects of the Versailles Treaty on German society, an experience that led him to declare that the treaty was "an international absurdity." Pacelli had been reconfirmed in his opinion that the neutral position taken by Benedict XV (even while not respected by the Allied

[3] See, for example these critics of Pius XII: John Cornwell, *Hitler's Pope: The Secret History of Pius XII* (London, 1999); Daniel Goldhagen, *A Moral Reckoning: The Role of the Catholic Church in the Holocaust and Its Unfulfilled Duty of Repair* (New York, 2003); and Dirk Verhofstadt, *Pius XII en de vernietiging van de joden* (Antwerpen and Amsterdam, 2008). As "pro-Pius XII" we note for example David G. Dalin, *The Myth of Hitler's Pope: How Pope Pius XII Rescued Jews from the Nazis* (Washington, 2005); Ronald Rychlak, *Hitler, the War and the Pope* (Huntington, 2000); and Hans Jansen, *De zwijgende paus? Het protest van Pius XII en zijn medewerkers tegen de jodenvervolging in Europa* (Kampen, 2000).

Forces) was ultimately the best possible option for the Roman Catholic Church.

Pacelli remained nuncio to Germany in the 1920s; and his post was moved to Berlin in 1925. All the while Pacelli not only understood the aftermath of World War One in Germany but also shared the Vatican's growing anxiety about the Communist regime that had been set up in Moscow. Throughout the 1920s, Pacelli was involved in secret conversations with the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, attempting to safeguard the freedom of Catholics in the Soviet Union. This failed, however, and in 1927 the conversations were ended, resulting in the aforementioned loss of control from the side of the Vatican over religious affairs in Soviet Russia. The latter is important for understanding the policies of Pope Pius XII. Throughout his entire pontificate, Pope Pius XII would take both the diplomatic attitude of Benedict XV and have to deal with various totalitarian regimes at once, whereby the Communist regime (condemned as an ideology since Pius IX) created his greatest anxieties, due to its open persecution of religion and its atheist ideology.

Pacelli stayed in Germany until late 1929—right after the Lateran Treaties were signed—and in 1930 he was appointed the Holy See's Secretary of State. During his nine years in that central position, Pacelli was able to sign a number of important concordats, among them the so-called *Reichskonkordat*: the agreement between the Vatican and the Nazi-regime, in July 1933.[4] This concordat sought to strengthen the position and protect the rights of Catholics under Nazi rule. However, it was often violated by the German government and under Pius XI's rule, Pacelli sent over fifty protest letters about violations of the agreement. Right from the start, Pacelli mistrusted the new German government; and together with the German Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber, he would draft Pope Pius XI's 1937 encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge*, whose publication was prohibited by the Nazis.[5]

1.1. *Pius XII and Totalitarianism*

Clearly because of his diplomatic qualities, Pius XII was elected in March 1939. In September of 1939 Germany annexed Poland. The new pope and his state secretary Cardinal Maglione had already feared this evolution

[4] Hubert Wolf, *Pope and Devil*, see chapter three: 'The Pact with the Devil? The Reichskonkordat, 1930–1933.'

[5] Pius XI, 'Mit Brennender Sorge (March 14, 1937),' *AAS* 29 (1937), 145–67.

and had made a radio appeal for peace in August 1939. During World War II, the results of the Vatican's double approach toward the Nazi regime (disagreement with its political and religious policies, while at the same time regarding it as a bulwark against the spread of Communism) were increasingly felt. Faced with the delicate task of positioning the Roman Catholic Church against two totalitarian regimes, Pius XII opted for the diplomatic model of Benedict XV: neutrality and diplomatic action behind the scenes. Although by 1943 Pius XII was aware of the extermination policies of the Nazi regime, policies that had been officially defined as the "*Endlösung*" at the January 1942 Wannsee-conference, and would lead to a devastating situation for minorities (Jews, gypsies, homosexuals, disabled people, etc.), he refrained from open condemnation. He did make allusions to it and criticized it in his June 2, 1943 address to the college of cardinals.[6]

Throughout the Second World War, Pius XII's main concern was for the Catholic populations over which he ruled; and his diplomatic efforts aimed strongly at safeguarding them from persecution. Painful events such as the persecution of Roman Catholics after the open condemnation of Nazi rule by the Dutch episcopate had led to the awareness that diplomatic action too could save lives.[7] One of the ways as pope to diplomatically proceed is with the support of bishops in their reflections and actions in favor of peace and the fate of the Jews in particular. It is no coincidence that shortly after the war, in 1946, the bishop of Münster, Clemens August Graf von Galen, was given the title of cardinal.[8]

For the Holy See, the Italian situation had become complex as well. In 1939 the Italian Fascist leader Benito Mussolini had signed a pact with Germany—resulting in the acceptance of the racial doctrines upheld by the Nazis within Italian Fascist circles. In 1940 Italy had declared war

---

[6] Pius XII, *Discorso di Sua Santità Pio XII al Sacro Collegio nel giorno del suo onomastico*, June 2, 1943.

[7] The archbishop of Utrecht, Johannes de Jong, was warned by the Nazis not to protest the deportation of Dutch Jews. In defiance, he published a letter on April 19, 1942, which was read in every Catholic Church in the country. The bishops of Holland jointly denounced "the unmerciful and unjust treatment meted out to Jews by those in power in our country." The Nazis responded by revoking the exception that had been given to Jews who had been baptized. The Gestapo rounded up every monk, nun, or priest who had even a drop of Jewish blood. Some 300 victims were deported to Auschwitz and immediately sent to the gas chambers. Among them was Edith Stein. See John Vidmar, *The Catholic Church Through the Ages* (Paramus, 2005), p. 331.

[8] Hubert Wolf, *Clemens August Graf von Galen: Gehorsam und Gewissen* (Freiburg, 2006).

against France and Great Britain. In Greece and the Northern African territories occupied by Italian forces, Germany had to help out the Italians, because they were losing the war against the Allied Forces. Starting in 1943, when the Germans were losing strength as a result of attacks by Soviet forces on its Eastern frontiers, the Allied Forces occupied parts of Italy and the Italian King Vittorio Emanuele III had Mussolini arrested. In 1943 the Italian armed forces surrendered, and a civil war broke out with riots between Fascist Italian guerilla groups and Allied Forces. The German forces reacted by conquering most of Italy, and, as a result, Vatican City State became isolated within the City of Rome. After that, Jewish deportations began as well in the City of Rome, lasting until June 1944, when the Allied Forces were capable of re-conquering the Eternal City. In April 1945, Mussolini—who had been liberated by the Germans—was arrested and assassinated in Milan. As a result of the internal Italian struggles, the monarchy was abolished after the war and Italy became a democratic republic.

After the end of World War II in 1945, the difficulties for Pius XII's pontificate were far from over. During the Conferences at Yalta, from February 4 to 11, 1945, and at Potsdam, July 17 to August 2, 1945, the world's top political leaders, the English Prime Minister Winston Churchill, the United States President Harry Truman, and the then Russian Prime Minister Joseph Stalin once more reorganized the international geo-political order. Just as his predecessor, Pius XII would have to cope with a new international political landscape and the new division of the world into two large spheres: one dominated by the United States and Western Europe and the other dominated by the influence of the Soviet Union and Communist China.[9]

The Cold War began immediately after that and soon the nuclear arms race dominated global political relationships. This implied that from the perspective of the Vatican, Communism remained a central problematic issue, as it had been since the nineteenth century; and post World War Two tensions were soon felt across the globe.[10] In Ukraine, for example, the entire Greek Catholic episcopacy was arrested and exiled, and Greek

[9] For a thorough survey of worldwide post-war Catholicism, see *Kirche und Katholizismus seit 1945*, edited in five separate volumes by Erwin Gatz: Vol. 1: *Mittel-, West- und Nordeuropa*; Vol. 2: *Ostmittel-, Ost- und SüdostEuropa*; Vol. 3: *Italien und Spanien*; Vol. 4: *Die Britischen Inseln und Nordamerika*; Vol. 5: *Die Länder Asiens* (Paderborn, 1998–2005).

[10] Dennis J. Dunn, *The Catholic Church and Russia: Popes, Patriarchs, Tsars and Commissars* (Burlington, 2004), pp. 133–52.

Catholics were coerced to convert to Russian Orthodoxy; and, as a consequence, they were put under state control. The church behind the Iron Curtain became a "Church of Silence." In December 1945, Pius XII condemned Communism and openly attacked the Russian Orthodox Patriarch Alexis, in his encyclical *Orientales omnes ecclesias*, promulgated on the 350th anniversary of the Union of Brest.[11] Pius XII would continue this policy for the rest of his pontificate with repeated condemnations of both the Communist ideology as well as the people supporting and holding it. This would be made clear on July 1, 1949, when the Holy Office (until 1968 the pope held the title of prefect) solemnly condemned Communism.[12]

2. *The Era of the Movements*

Next to the complexity of its political policies, the pontificate of Pope Pius XII was also an important period of transition within twentieth-century Catholic thought. Where once the attempts of several popes to cope with modernity and its harsh rejection by the magisterium had led to major conflicts such as the modernist crisis, the pontificate of Pope Pius XII can be regarded as a first step toward the Second Vatican Council—which can ultimately be read as a council complementing Vatican I's very first attempts at dealing with the modern world. Under the rule of Pope Pius XII, important steps were taken that gave more room to several movements growing within the Catholic Church, since the beginning of the twentieth century.[13] On issues such as biblical scholarship, liturgical renewal, and even ecumenism, important openings were created for internal Catholic renewal. In other words, both historically and theologically speaking, Vatican II can certainly not be regarded as a clearcut rupture with the past magisterium. On the other hand, there were discontinuities as well; and the 1942 and 1950 repeated condemnations of the so-called *nouvelle théologie* provide just one example of Pius XII's continuity with the nineteenth-century heritage.

---

[11] Pius XII, 'Orientales omnes ecclesias (December 23, 1945),' *AAS* 38 (1946), 33–63.

[12] The decree excommunicated all who supported communism. Pius XII, 'Responsa ad dubia de communismo (July 1, 1949),' *AAS* 41 (1949), 334.

[13] See Pedro Fernández Rodriguez, 'Los movimientos eclesiales, primavera del Concilio,' *Ciencia Tomista* 126 (1999), pp. 201–11; and Étienne Fouilloux, 'Les mouvements réformistes dans la pensée catholique européenne (première moitié du XX siècle),' in *Vatican II au Canada: Enracinement et réception*, ed. Gilles Routhier [Héritage et projet 64] (Montréal, 2001), pp. 27–40.

A nuanced reappraisal, keeping in mind the complex and simultaneous presence and intersection of continuities (*in plural*) and discontinuities (*again in plural*) in the development of Catholicicm is needed to evaluate the pontificate of Pope Pius XII and its relationship with what came next in the history of the Catholic Church. In order to do so, our next part will trace the evolution of some of the most important renewal movements, making clear that "what happened at Vatican II,"[14] did not fall out of the sky.[15] Before doing so, a brief observation that, due to tremendous growth in Marian devotion, Pope Pius XII decided to solemnly define the dogma of the Assumption of Mary; and he did so on November 1, 1950 in the Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus*.[16] Since the First Vatican Council, up until the present day, this is the only time a Pope has used his right to issue an infallible declaration.

2.1. *The Biblical Movement*

The biblical movement can only be properly understood against the backdrop of the early twentieth-century modernist crisis—which in turn is a significant moment in the Catholic Church's lingering efforts to integrate modern Post Enlightenment thinking and Christian doctrine. As indicated in the previous chapter, key moments were the encyclical by Leo XIII in 1893, *Providentissimus Deus* and the early twentieth-century condemnations under Pius X. As argued before, these repressive measures led to a climate of fear and crisis within the bosom of the Catholic Church, causing many scholars to refrain from publishing the results of their historical critical research into early Christian origins. Although this climate changed under Benedict XV and Pius XI, it would only be under the pontificate of Pius XII that Catholic biblical scholarship really changed.

In all of this, the evolution of the Pontifical Biblical Commission is striking, as well as the evolution made by the Pontifical Biblical Institute, founded in 1909 by Louis Billot and up until today operated by the Society of Jesus in Rome. Both had been actively anti-modernist organs; but, as early as the 1930s, both began to steer a less anti-modernist course,

---

[14] John W. O'Malley, *What happened at Vatican II?* (Cambridge, 2008).

[15] See also *La théologie catholique entre intransigeance et renouveau: La reception des mouvements préconciliaires à Vatican II*, ed. Gilles Routhier, Philippe J. Roy, and Karim Schelkens [BRHE 95] (Turnhout, Louvain-la-Neuve and Louvain, 2011).

[16] Pius XII, 'Munificentissimus Deus (November 1, 1950),' *AAS* 42 (1950), 753–71.

gradually accepting the necessity and validity of biblical historical-critical research.

In 1930 Augustin Bea, a German Jesuit, became the new rector of the Biblical Institute and under his guidance the institute began changing course. It finally adopted the historical-critical method developed by Marie-Joseph Lagrange in 1903. In 1945, when Cardinal Pacelli had been active as Pope Pius XII for several years already, Bea became his personal confessor until his final years. This would have tremendous consequences for the development of Catholic biblical scholarship. During the modernist crisis the neo-scholastic and anti-modernist currents had been identified with the magisterium's positions and had openly attacked Lagrange's views. Now, in 1943, this identification of the anti-modernist integrist positions with the Catholic magisterium had begun to fade.

On September 30, 1943, on the fiftieth anniversary of *Providentissimus Deus*, Pius XII promulgated the encyclical *Divino afflante spiritu*.[17] The encyclical had been drafted almost in its entirety by Bea, who turned it into an hardly disguised canonization of Lagrange's exegetical standpoints. This created a great sense of relief among biblical scholars, who now felt supported in publishing many of the results they had achieved in years past. In *Divino afflante*, the biblical authorship of God is not denied, but it is reframed in an historical perspective. The encyclical conceeded that all biblical texts have been written by humans, and that this has its consequences for the text, its style, its language, etc. Therefore, in order to attain the true sense of the text, scholars were now allowed to study it critically. Along the same lines, the inspired character of Scripture was not denied, but again an enhanced perspective was applied, in which a distinction could be made between historical and contingent forms of expression and the ideas and doctrines intended by God. This had great implications for the notion of scriptural inerrancy: the doctrines expressed in the scriptures are accepted as inerrant, yet contradictions and problems in the text need no longer be solved via concordist theological harmonizations. They now could be approached as the consequences of historical contingencies, without necessarily posing problems at the level of doctrinal truth.[18]

---

[17] Pius XII, 'Divino afflante Spiritu (September 30, 1943),' *AAS* 35 (1943), 297–325.

[18] On the critical study of the Bible, its development and the polemic centered around Scripture (and revelation), see Joseph G. Prior, *The Historical Critical Method in Catholic Exegesis* [Tesi Gregoriana: Serie teologia 50] (Rome, 1999); Silouane Ponga, *L'Écriture, âme de la théologie: Le problème de la suffisance matérielle des Écritures* [Théologies] (Paris, 2008); Karim Schelkens, *Catholic Theology of Revelation on the Eve of Vatican II: A Redaction*

In sum: the encyclical accepted that a methodical distinction is made between revelation (as the historical encounter with the Son of God) itself and the way it is offered to us in Sacred Scripture. Or, more concisely: Scripture is not revelation, it *contains* and *conveys* revelation.

Such an approach went far from the neo-Thomist view of Sacred Scripture as well as earlier documents from the Pontifical Biblical Commission. In 1948 a "Letter to Cardinal Suhard" was published on the origins of the Pentateuch.[19] The commission no longer maintained that the five books ascribed to Moses were literally written by him; and now the presence of different historical textual layers was gradually being accepted. Catholic exegetes experienced this as a liberation. At the same time, however, encyclicals such as *Humani generis* in 1950 warned that exegesis has its limits;[20] and Catholic exegesis should not evolve into a merely philological dissection of texts. Rather, it should be at the service of the church's discernment of the truth. Still, the position accepted in *Divino afflante* is important; and Pope Pius XII would defend this position in 1958, in his final days, in a statement addressed to an international conference of Catholic exegetes meeting in Brussels, on the occasion of the 1958 World Exposition.

This is not to say that the neo-Thomist and anti-modernist perspective no longer existed. On the eve of the Second Vatican Council, and more precisely between 1955 and 1960, some professors in exegesis from the Lateran Seminary (later the *Lateran University*) openly attacked the methods proposed and applied by scholars of the *Biblicum*. In 1959 and 1960 this led to an open and harsh controversy, between Jesuit professors such as Luis Alonso-Schökel, Stanislas Lyonnet and Maximilian Zerwick on the one hand, and Lateran professors such as Francesco Spadafora and Antonino Romeo. The situation worsened to such an extent that the Lateran professors openly accused their "opponents" of being modernists. Backed by the Congregation of the Holy Office, led by Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani, and the Congregation for Seminaries and Universities, this led to teaching prohibitions for Zerwick and Lyonnet, who were later rehabilitated by Pope John XXIII. In this sense, in the controversy known as the "neo-modernist

---

History of the Schema "De fontibus revelationis", 1960–1962 [BSCH 41] (Leiden and Boston, 2010).

[19] Pontifical Biblical Commission, 'Lettre au card Suhard (January 16, 1948),' *AAS* 40 (1948), 45–8.

[20] Pius XII, 'Humani generis (August 12, 1950),' *AAS* 42 (1950), 561–78.

controversy" one is faced with the simultaneous presence of two currents of Catholic thought right up until the opening of Vatican II.[21]

2.2. *The Ecumenical Movement*

Whereas scientific interest in the earliest centuries of Christianity was raised within the biblical movement, another important movement also harkened back to early forms of Christianity in a quite different way. The ecumenical movement did not spring from scientific research but everyday missionary practice.[22] More precisely, the missionary experiences of members of various churches in the United States and the Canadian Western territories, as well as in Africa and Latin America, led to an increased awareness of Christian disunity and conflict. Quite often, priests and pastors entered into a real competition with each other in order to reach as many "souls" as possible and convert them to their own respective churches. Already by the end of the nineteenth century, this missionary proselytism had given rise to painful situations of conflicting and competing Christian priests and preachers, in some occasions leading to armed conflict and religious conflicts within indigenous populations. All of this resulted in a growing awareness of the scandal of Christian division and a longing for a restoration of a more unified Christianity as it was perceived to have been in Christendom's first centuries, before the Eastern schism of 1054, and the sixteenth-century Western schisms.

In short, the origins of ecumenism are found in the missionary experiences and in a longing for basic human encounter and cooperation among Christians. At first, this resulted in a search for common practical initiatives in local towns and communities; but increasingly missionary leaders felt the need to set up cooperative structures stretching over the confines of confessions and denominations. In 1910 the World Missionary Conference was organized under the presidency of later Nobel Peace Prize winner John R. Mott. Mott was a Methodist pastor, and had been leader of the World Student Christian Federation, striving for peace among others via reconciliation among Protestant churches. At the World Missionary

---

[21] Schelkens, *Catholic Theology of Revelation*, 111–32.

[22] On the ecumenical movement, see the aforementioned book by Fouilloux, *Les catholiques et l'unité chrétienne*; Thomas G. Fitzgerald, *The Ecumenical Movement: An Introductory History* [Contributions to the Study of Religion 72] (Westport, 2004); *Celebrating a Century of Ecumenism: Exploring the Achievements of International Dialogue, In Commemoration of the Centenary of the 1910 Edinburgh World Missionary Conference* ed. John A. Radano (Grand Rapids, 2012).

Conference in Edinburgh in 1910, Mott put on the agenda the topic of "co-operation and the promotion of Christian unity" (item ten on the agenda). Generally, this is regarded as the foundational moment for the modern ecumenical movement. By 1921, this led to the establishment of the World Missionary Council.

At the same time, other Protestant movements had emerged seeking inter-confessional collaboration and dialogue. On the pastoral level this was done in the Life and Work movement. The doctrinal perspective of dialogue was more developed in the Faith and Order movement. By 1937, plans were made to integrate all three aforementioned movements into one World Council of Churches (WCC).[23] However, as a result of the outbreak of World War II, these plans were postponed only to be realized in 1948. The 1948 assembly at Amsterdam was a crucial moment for the development of the ecumenical movement. The newly founded WCC would appoint John R. Mott as a lifelong honorary president and would be led henceforth by the Dutch Secretary General, Willem Adolf Visser 't Hooft. The initial constitution of the WCC defined its identity as follows: "The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior." Later, in the WCC's 1950 "Toronto Statement," the elements of confession, the reference to Scripture, and a Trinitarian perspective were added, resulting in the following definition:

> The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior according to the scriptures and therefore seek to fulfill together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.[24]

Initially, the WCC consisted almost entirely of Protestant churches, leading to criticisms accusing it of being a "Protestant confederation." This changed throughout the 1950s, when more and more contacts with Orthodox churches were made and in 1959, at the Rhodes Central Committee Meeting, plans were made for the integration of several Orthodox churches. This was realized in the 1961 New Delhi Assembly.

In the meantime, Catholics had also become interested in contact with representatives of other confessions. Although the official doctrine

---

[23] On the World Council of Churches, also see David P. Gaines, *The World Council of Churches* (Peterborough, 1966).

[24] See World Council of Churches, *Minutes and Report of the Third Meeting of the Central Committee*, Toronto July 9–15, 1950, IV, 5.

of Roman Catholicism, since Trent and emphasized since Pius IX, had stressed that Roman Catholicism is the only true religion—leading to missionary practices and urging other Christian confessions to convert to Catholicism—the Vatican had, in the so-called 1940s Boston heresy case,[25] refrained from promulgating the exclusivist doctrine claiming that there is "no salvation *outside* the church"—which had also not reached the final documents of Vatican I—, clinging to the inclusivist position that there is "no salvation *without* the church." Regardless of the fact that Catholicism presented itself as the only confession to be the bearer of the fullness of revelation, this did make a great difference.[26]

Below the radar of the official level, matters evolved after the First World War, and as of the 1920s more and more Catholics became engaged in contacts with people belonging to other confessions. A series of meetings was organized in the years 1921 to 1927, known as the "Malines Conversations," and focused on Anglican/Roman Catholic dialogue.[27] They were organized largely on the initiative of Belgian Cardinal Désiré Joseph Mercier, but with tacit support from the Vatican and the archbishops of Canterbury and York. Although the number of participants varied, over the six years, they included on the Anglican side Charles Lindley Wood ("Lord Halifax"), bishops Walter Howard Frere, Charles Gore, and Armitage Robinson (Dean of Wells). The Catholic participants included Mercier himself, Pierre Battifol, Hyppolyte Hemmer, Fernand Portal, and Mercier's successor Joseph Ernest Van Roey. Mercier died in January 1926 and Van Roey, who was not keen on them, wound up the conversations in 1927. Dom Lambert Beauduin's 1925 paper *L'église anglicane unie, mais non*

---

[25] In the late 1940s, the U.S. Jesuit Leonard Feeney (and his followers at Saint Benedict Center at Cambridge, Massachussets) propagated an increasingly rigorist understanding of the doctrine of salvation, restricting the possibility of salvation to Catholics and those explicitly wanting to convert to Roman Catholicism. After some quarrels with both the diocesan and Jesuit authorities and a refusal from the side of Feeney to mitigate his position, the Congregation for the Holy Office intervened and condemned Feeney in a letter entitled *Suprema haec sacra*. See 'A Letter from the Holy Office [*Suprema haec sacra*],' *American Ecclesiastical Review* 127 (1952), 307–15; George B. Pepper, *The Boston Heresy Case in View of the Secularization of Religion: A Case Study in the Sociology of Religion* (Lewiston, 1988); and Maria Carosio, 'Extra ecclesiam nulla salus: Il caso Feeney,' *CrSt* 25 (2004), 833–76.

[26] For background on the issue, see Francis A. Sullivan's landmark study: *Salvation Outside the Church? Tracing the History of the Catholic Response* (New York, 1992).

[27] See John A. Dick, *The Malines Conversations Revisited* [BETL 85] (Louvain, 1989); *From Malines to ARCIC: The Malines Conversations Commemorated*, ed. Adelbert Denaux, with the collaboration of John A. Dick [BETL 130] (Louvain, 1997).

absorbée was an important part of their discussions.[28] Initiatives such as the Malines Conversations led to strong personal commitments and to a deepened sense of respect for other Christian traditions. Nevertheless, the initiatives were truncated by Pope Pius XI's 1928 encyclical *Mortalium animos*, condemning Protestantism, prohibiting Catholics from participating in ecumenical dialogue, and stressing that true ecumenism can only consist of an "ecumenism of return" (to Catholicism).[29]

The Catholic magisterium's attitude vis-à-vis the Orthodox churches was less condemnatory. In 1924, Pius XI had issued his Apostolic Letter *Equidem verba*, directed to the Abbot Primate of the Benedictine Order, promoting contacts with Eastern Christianity.[30] This had some consequences in the 1920s and 1930s: An institute like that of the Paris Dominicans, called *Istina*, was founded in 1927 for dialogue and contact with Russian Orthodox exiles in France. One of the Dominicans living there, Yves Congar, would publish his influential volume *Chrétiens désunis* in 1937.[31] In Belgium as well efforts were increasingly made. In 1925, Dom Lambert Beauduin founded a monastery at Amay-sur-Meuse (later moved to Chevetogne) devoted to contacts with the Eastern Churches and celebrating the Byzantine liturgy. The Belgian theologian Gustave Thils, wrote his *Histoire doctrinale du mouvement oecuménique* in 1938, opening developments within the ecumenical movement for a wider public.[32] In the 1930s and 1940s, under Nazi occupation, many Catholics entering the resistance were also forced to live and collaborate with members from other churches. Here too, basic human encounter and cooperation led to an increased awareness of the importance of Christian unity; and German Catholic theologians, such as Paul Simon, paved the way for ecumenical awareness, influenced by the ecclesiological perspectives developed by protagonists such as Romano Guardini.[33]

Once more, it appears that Catholic renewal, and in this case Catholic involvement in ecumenical matters, only really blossomed under the pontificate of Pope Pius XII. Notwithstanding his attacks on Russian Orthodoxy under Soviet control, he did, on December 20, 1949—a year after the

---

[28] Lambert Beauduin, *L'église anglicane unie, non absorbée* (Malines, 1977).

[29] Pius XI, 'Mortalium animos (January 6, 1928),' *AAS* 20 (1928), 5–16.

[30] Cf. Jean-Baptiste Van der Heijden, *L'église Byzantine de Chevetogne* (Brussels, 1993).

[31] Yves Congar, *Chrétiens désunis: Principes d'un œcuménisme catholique* [Unam sanctam 1] (Paris, 1937).

[32] Gustave Thils, *Histoire doctrinale du mouvement oecuménique* [BETL 8] (Louvain, 1955, new edition in 1963).

[33] Jörg Ernesti, *Ökumene im dritten Reich: Einheit und Erneuerung* (Paderborn, 2007).

WCC-foundation—create openness for Catholics to become engaged in ecumenism via the publication of on *Instructio de motione oecumenica*.[34] This openness had significant effect. Two Catholic priests from the Netherlands, Frans Thijssen and Johannes Willebrands, who had already been in contact much earlier with Visser 't Hooft, initiated a round of contacts with Catholic ecumenical institutes in France (Istina), Belgium (Monastery of Chevetogne) and the new *Foyer Unitas* founded by the Jesuit Charles Boyer in Rome. Later, contacts with Germany would follow, involving the Johann-Adam-Möhler Institut. Collaborating with representatives from of all of these institutes, they set up the *Catholic Conference for Ecumenical Questions* in 1951, which would unite Catholic ecumenists and gather them for conferences with Protestants and Orthodox, on a regular basis, up until the time of Vatican II.

2.3. *Catholic Action*

Drawing inspiration from the encyclical *Rerum novarum* of 1891 the period between the two world wars, and the first decade after World War Two witnessed various social-Gospel type initiatives and movements. Their common denominators consisted in uniting people, enhancing social contact, and promoting personal wellbeing. The most widely recognized exponent was undoubtedly the Catholic Action movement, strongly promoted by Pope Pius XI in his battle against secularization. In fact, the movement of Catholic Action had emerged out of a variety of often local Catholic lay organizations in the early decades of the twentieth century. These movements had been spread all over Europe, including organizations such as the Spanish *Associación católicos*, and the *Jeunesse ouvrière chrétienne* in France[35] and Belgium—where it was mainly driven by protagonists such as Joseph Cardijn.[36] Cardijn inaugurated the motto of "observe, judge, and act" and thus offered many people a life motto that formed the cornerstone for a conscientious Christian life. In the social movement, therefore, the value of the human person, in everything he or she does, was central. In the German speaking areas the aforementioned *Pius Verein* was active,

[34] Congregation for the Holy Office, 'Ecclesia Catholica: Instructio ad locarum ordinarios De motione oecumenica,' *AAS* 42 (1950), 12–7.

[35] Joseph Debès and Émile Poulat, *L'appel de la JOC, 1926–1928* (Paris, 1986).

[36] Concerning Catholic Action see Gerd-Rainer Horn, *Left Catholicism 1943–1955: Catholics and Society in Western Europe at the Point of Liberation* [KADOC Studies 25] (Louvain, 2001).

as well as the *Katholische Verein* and the *Kolping* movement,[37] while in Italy the *Società della gioventù cattolica italiana*, the *Opera dei congressi e comitati cattolici* and last but certainly not least the *Federazione universitaria cattolica italiana* (*FUCI*) was active,[38] and the *Association catholique de la jeunesse Belge* in Belgium.[39]

Although initially scattered, many of these movements and organizations shared common features on the level of their spirituality, such as their focus on the family, and the conviction that family and work were closely connected not only to strengthen society but to enhance Catholic life. In this sense, the European movements found their counterpart in the United States in the activities of the *Catholic Worker Movement*, led in the same era by people such as Dorothy Day[40]—who, in turn, had been influenced by the French social philosophy brought to her by Peter Maurin. The fact that French influences weighed so heavily was no surprise. In France, even after Pius XI's curtailing of the *Action Française*, Catholic social movements lingered on, even though they sometimes faced strong suspicions and doubts from Roman leadership. One such movement whose growth and development were constantly monitored was the phenomenon of the worker-priests, especially in the years after the Second World War. Considering the poor status and the harsh working conditions of the working class, many French Catholics saw this commitment of priests to the working classes as a positive pastoral development, a stimulus for workers to stand up for their rights, and an encouraging sign of contemporary evangelism. On the spiritual level, the priest-worker movement was supported by Dominicans such as Marie-Dominique Chenu, Yves Congar and others. Nevertheless, it was looked at with increasing distrust by some church leaders who feared that laypeople would somehow contaminate priestly souls. There were also hierarchical worries about the fact that some of these worker-priests were joining communist-syndicates, and went on to play a central role in helping to organize strikes. Some saw this as well

---

[37] Felix Raabe, *Die Katholiken und ihre Verbände in der Zeit der Weimarer Republik*, in, *Geschichte des Kirchlichen Lebens in den Deutschsprachigen Ländern seit dem Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Erwin Gatz (Freiburg, 2008); also see *Katholiken und Gewerkschaftsbewegung 1890–1945*, ed. Herbert Hömig (Paderborn, 2003).

[38] John Pollard, *Catholicism in Modern Italy: Religion, Society and Politics since 1861* (London & New York).

[39] Françoise Rosart and Thierry Scaillet, *Entre jeux et enjeux: Mouvements de jeunesse catholiques en Belgique, 1910–1940*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 2002, p. 21. Also see Lucie Bragard et al., *La Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne: Wallonie* Bruxelles 1912–1957 (Brussels, 1990).

[40] William D. Miller, *Dorothy Day: A Biography* (San Francisco, 1982).

as an infidelity to the positions proposed by Leo XIII's *Rerum novarum*. Penalized by the highest church leadership, a number of worker-priests were ordered to submit to church authority, distance themselves from their "job," and return to "the appropriate channels" of pastoral life and evangelization.[41]

All of the above social action movements raised hopes of uniting the movements somehow at an international level. Already under Benedict XV, efforts had been made to unite scattered activities and lay organizations under one single umbrella, which in Italy, by 1922, had led to the establishment of the *Azione Cattolica Italiana* (ACI).[42] Pius XI had been very active in reorganizing the movement, as a part of his program of "instaurare omnia in Christo," describing Catholic Action as the "participation" of the laity in the apostolate of the Catholic hierarchy. A striking turn in this attitude was seen under Pius XII, who already in his 1939 encyclical *Summi pontificatus* had used the term "collaboration" to describe the modus operandi of the laity and the hierarchy—an element that would be picked up in the Vatican II debates on the role of the laity. Finally, by the end of the 1940s, from within the ACI and supported by Monsignor Giovanni Battista Montini, voices were calling for an internationalization of the movement under Roman leadership. This would have some consequences for the local Catholic Action movements, as a unification and reorganization would increase the sense of its being led "from above." The movement was thus supported but also controlled by the hierarchy, and this model would be developed further on the international scene during the pontificate of Pius XII—who set aside the movements last lay leaders in Italy.[43]

Throughout the 1950s then, the Catholic Action movement gained momentum through several factors. For a start, this general sense of the emerging role of lay people in Catholicism came to the fore during the massive international conferences on the lay apostolate, organized in 1951 and 1957. They turned the decade preceding Vatican II into a crucial moment for the re-positioning of the lay people within the church.[44] As

---

41 Cf. François Leprieur, *Quand Rome condamne: Dominicains et prêtres-ouvriers* [Terre humaine] (Paris, 1989); Émile Poulat, *Les prêtres-ouvriers: Naissance et fin* [Histoire] (Paris, 1999).

42 Giacomo de Antonellis, *Storia dell'Azione Cattolica* (Milan, 1987).

43 Cf. Gianfranco Poggi, *Catholic Action in Italy* (Stanford, 1967), p. 39.

44 Bernard Minvielle, *L'apostolat des laics à la veille du Concile, 1949–1959: Histoire des Congrès mondiaux de 1951 et 1957* [Studia friburgensia: Series historica 2] (Fribourg, 2001). Also see the Conference acts of these gatherings, in *Actes du 1er Congrès Mondial pour*

a result of the 1951 meeting, the Permanent Committee of International Congresses for the Lay Apostolate (COPECIAL) was established, and would serve as international organism to promote collaborative exchange between Catholic lay people. The actions of COPECIAL and the large conferences of the 1950s would impact the theological realm as well. The lay apostolate was increasingly supported by theologians such as Yves Congar and Gerard Philips, who developed a "theology of the laity," stressing the particular calling and place of non-ordained men and women within the church.[45]

2.4. *The Liturgical Movement*

The liturgical movement can only be properly understood as a movement for deepening and promoting the participation of all in Christian life.[46] This movement, as noted earlier, also originated at the beginning of the twentieth century, during the pontificate of Pius X and his liturgical efforts. Interest in the liturgy was strongly marked by ultramontanist characteristics, using the liturgy to promote ecclesiastical centralization and commissioning the Benedictine Order with the task of organizing liturgical reform. Dom Guéranger had been a vehement opponent of local French liturgies and in his striving toward liturgical unification, he promoted Gregorian chant and the Roman rite as the only truly Roman Catholic liturgy. An important element of Guéranger's nineteenth-century efforts, however, was his conviction that the Benedictine liturgy could be an important impetus for the creation of Catholic elites and intellectuals. This Benedictine monastic model would survive for a long period, even when some monasteries began distancing themselves from some of the positions held by Guéranger. The monastic "paradigm" itself remained: the Roman liturgy as a means for elevating the spiritual life of lay people

---

l'Apostolat des Laïcs (Rome, 1952); *Former des Apôtres—Documents du Deuxième Congrès Mondial pour l'Apostolat des Laïcs* (Rome, 1959).

[45] Yves Congar, *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat* (Paris, 1953); and one year later appeared the French volume by Gerard Philips, *Le rôle du laïcat dans l'église* (Cahiers de l'actualité religieuse] (Paris, 1954). Philips's book had been published in Dutch, already in 1952, which makes him one of the earliest pioneers to develop a catholic theology of the laity. For more background see Philippe Chenaux, 'Dall'apostolato alla missione: Il ruolo dei laici nella Chiesa e nel mondo,' in *L'eredità del magistero di Pio XII*, pp. 285–97.

[46] On the liturgical movement, see Bernard Botte, *Le mouvement liturgique: Témoignage et souvenirs* (Paris, 1973); John Fenwick and Bryan Spinks, *Worship in Transition: The Twentieth Century Liturgical Movement* (Edinburgh, 1995). Also see the inspiring article by Mathijs Lamberigts, 'The Liturgical Movement in Germany and the Low Countries,' in *La theologie catholique entre intransigeance et renouveau*, pp. 91–121.

would spread widely due to the successful expansion of the Benedictine Order and its abbeys. For instance, the Abbey of Solesmes was the starting point for a wide network of Benedictine monasteries in northern Europe. In 1863 it had re-founded the Abbey of Beuron, Germany. In its turn, Beuron would become an important starting point for two other Benedictine abbeys. After obtaining approval from the monks of Maredsous, in Belgium, the Benedictines from Beuron founded the Abbey of Mont-César in 1899 near Louvain, Belgium. Earlier on, they had also re-opened the German Abbey of Maria Laach in 1872. All of these Benedictine monasteries would become centers for liturgical art, for the promotion of Gregorian chant, and for a more biblical and spiritual liturgy.

It is against this background that the official start of the Catholic liturgical movement in 1909 should be understood. Dom Lambert Beauduin, a Benedictine from Mont-César was invited by Cardinal Mercier—a promoter of neo-Thomism who supported the reforms of Pius X in this domain—to deliver a speech on liturgical reform at the Catholic Congress of Malines in that year. Beauduin's lecture criticized a rubricist and too legalistic approach to liturgy, claiming that it should be at the service of a "lived experience" of God. He underlined the importance of the liturgy as a means for creating Christian unity—which he would apply in the Monastery of Chevetogne later on; and he stressed the importance and need for translating Latin texts into the vernacular. Very significantly, Beauduin had used the term "active participation" coined by Pius X in the Italian version of his 1903 *Tra le sollecitudini*.[47] This led to some criticism by others, who feared that it would endanger popular devotion; and they accused the young liturgical movement of being an elitist movement.

Nevertheless, the fruits of this early liturgical movement would soon be spread via periodicals such as *Questions liturgiques* and *Liturgisch tijdschrift*, both founded in 1914. In that same year, Beauduin published his influential book *La piété de l'Église*.[48] Unfortunately, Pius X's death and the First World War called an untimely halt to the early liturgical movement. Nevertheless the ideas spread in Germany, via Benedictines such as Odo Casel at the abbey Maria Laach, but also outside of the battlegrounds, in England, the United States, and in the Netherlands (which remained neutral during the First World War). Among the Dutch, the movement

47 Pius X, 'Tra le sollecitudini (November 22, 1903),' *ASS* 36 (1903), 329–39. Remarkably enough, the official Latin version did not contain the expression *actuosa participation*.

48 Lambert Beauduin, *La piété de l'église: Principes et faits* (Louvain, 1914).

developed a new profile, for there it was that secular parish priests became involved in liturgical reform, such as the Dean of Rotterdam, Fredericus van Beukering. Liturgical congresses, such as one that took place in Breda, the Netherlands in 1911, had already created a sense of enthusiasm, by gathering hundreds of people, including large groups of women. Then, in 1915 the Flemish Benedictine monk of Affligem, Franco de Wyels, published his *Volksmissaal* (People's Missal), offering liturgical texts in translation to enable the faithful to understand what the priest was saying in Latin. This became very popular in the Dutch-speaking areas, and by 1930, the abbey had sold over 75.000 copies of it. Even more influential was the *Missel vespéral romain*, published in its first edition in 1920, by Dom Gaspar Lefebvre, of the francophone Abbey of Saint-André, in Bruges. This missal had over 80 editions and was soon translated into English, Polish, Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese, making it one of the most influential Catholic publications of the era.

Under the pontificate of Pius XI, between the world wars, most of the liturgical initiatives were still being launched in Benedictine abbeys; and certainly Maria Laach became a renowned center, led by its abbot Ildefons Herwegen. The classical model was the pre-given and in itself immutable liturgy. The people's participation was promoted by translations of the liturgical texts in the vernacular, which were often very (even too) literally translated. Herwegen had a profound impact on lay participation in the movement through his liturgical retreats. Participating in his retreats were a number of leadership personalities, such as the philosopher Hermann Platz, who became engaged in ecumenism between the wars and later opposed the Nazi regime. For Platz, the Catholic liturgy would become a spiritual point of departure, which carried over into social and political action, as expressed in his 1916 book *Krieg und Seele*.[49] Also Heinrich Brüning, German chancellor in the early 1930s and an opponent of Hitler, would participate, just as Robert Schumann—who similarly resisted the Nazis and later became one of the founding fathers of the European Economic Community (EEC). All of this very well illustrates how the early Catholic liturgical movement had always been closely tied to the milieu of Catholic Action and Catholic youth movements, and therefore had a large social and political impact.

This brings us to the liturgical movement outside of the monastic world. In 1922, it would be Platz, who brought Romano Guardini in contact with

[49] Hermann Platz, *Krieg und Seele* (Mönchengladbach, 1916).

the German youth movement Quickborn. Guardini had already been an adherent of liturgical renewal since he had visited Beuron in 1906. Then, as a priest, he had tried to involve his parishioners in his celebration of the liturgy, feeling frustrated by the custom that while the priest would "read his mass," the faithful would sit and pray their rosary, not understanding what was happening. This awareness led to his 1918 book on the spirit of the liturgy, which constituted a milestone in the liturgical movement.[50] In 1920, Guardini published his booklet entitled *Gemeinschaftliche Andacht zur Feier der heiligen Messe*, which contained a simplified German translation of the ordinary of mass.[51] It also created space for a worship dialogue between the celebrant and the faithful, leading to a Eucharistic celebration called the *Gemeinschaftsmesse*. This initiative was soon highly successful within German youth movements and Guardini's 1920 booklet sold over a 500,000 copies.

In Austria, the movement took a different turn, somewhat similar to what happened in the Netherlands: there Pius Parsch, an Augustinian canon active in a parish at Klosterneuburg, started speaking of the *Volksliturgische Bewegung* (the people's liturgical movement). Parsch distanced himself from Guardini's monastic inspired model, preferring to work from the current dynamics within his own parish. In 1922 he introduced the so-called *Chormesse* (choir mass) focusing more on the interplay between the choir, the faithful, and the priest. Over the years, this initiative evolved into what would ultimately be called the *Betsingmesse* (Pray-and-sing-mass). This featured the introduction of vernacular (German) chant, and thereby distanced itself clearly from the Benedictine monastic tradition that had stayed attached to Gregorian chant. In September 1933 at the Vienna *Katholikentag*, this new type of mass was celebrated by the Viennese Cardinal Theodor Innitzer, who would support its promotion in all the diocesan parishes. With these two models, therefore, we find the double-theme essence of the pre-conciliar liturgical movement. One is the monastic type of renewal featuring an upward line, where attention is paid to informing and instructing the faithful and offering them vernacular translations of liturgical texts. The ordinary of the mass was not altered. The second type is the parish or secular model type of liturgical renewal, which offers a downward movement. In the Pius Parsch

---

[50] Romano Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie* [Ecclesia orans 1] (Freiburg, 1918); English translation, *The Spirit of Liturgy* (New York, 1998).

[51] Romano Guardini, *Gemeinschaftliche Andacht zur Feier der heiligen Messe* (Düsseldorf, 1920).

stream of liturgical initiatives, the central idea was that "the faith of the people should be normative for the liturgical practice." This implied that the canon of mass itself should also be adapted to local needs.[52]

In the period during and immediately after the Second World War, the liturgical movement became a bit scattered; but, at the same time, it became more and more officialized. It gradually incorporated the mystical body ecclesiology, promoted by the 1943 encyclical *Mystici corporis*.[53] It also became increasingly interconnected with *ressourcement* movements of patristic and biblical renewal and sought to align the practice of worship with the models found in the early church, rather than the medieval paradigm of neo-scholasticism. Finally in 1947 Pius XII, who during his German years had become well acquainted with the liturgical reform efforts rising in Northern Europe, and in particularly in the Germanophone world, promulgated the encyclical *Mediator Dei et hominum*.[54]

Mediator Dei et hominum constituted an important moment of officialization for the liturgical movement. It openly praised the active participation of the faithful, while it remained vague about other issues such as the common priesthood of all believers. It stressed the important role of the local bishop and promoted the founding of diocesan liturgical commissions. Pius XII also made it clear that Latin would remain the "official" language of the Roman rite, advocating the classical language as a symbol of unity. At the same time, the pope recognized the value of the use of the vernacular in parts of Catholic worship, making clear that this was to be done in agreement with Rome. The encyclical paved the way for a series of national initiatives, approved by the Holy See, leading to the publication of a series of bilingual rituals: In the same year as the encyclical *Mediator Dei*, a French-Latin ritual was approved (1947), followed by the German *Collectio rituum* (1950) and an English-Latin as well as an Italian-Latin version later (1956). Also, in 1955 the rubrics of the breviary and the Roman missal were simplified, etc.

Much of the liturgical reforms accepted and promulgated by Vatican II were therefore well prepared under popes such as Pius XII, preceding John XXIII. Already in these pre-conciliar years many proposals for

---

[52] For this analysis, see Lamberigts, 'The Liturgical Movement,' p. 100.

[53] Pius XII, 'Mystici corporis Christi (June 29, 1943),' *AAS* 35 (1943), 200–43. See also Émile Mersch, *Le corps mystique du Christ: Étude de théologie historique*, 2 Vols. [Museum lessianum: Section théologique 28–29] (Paris, 1933; third edition in Louvain, 1951); Émile Mersch, *La théologie du corps mystique*, 2 Vols. [Museum lessianum: Section théologique 38–39] (Paris, 1944).

[54] Pius XII, 'Mediator Dei et hominum (November 20, 1947),' *AAS* 39 (1947), 521–95.

changes were attacked, even by the venerable Abbey of Solesmes, which had not always followed the evolutions in other Benedictine monasteries and had remained a center for the promotion of Gregorian chant. Leading figures were former Solesmes monks Paul Nau and Georges Frénaud, both of whom had studied at the *Séminaire Français de Rome*, and had good contacts with Marcel Lefebvre.[55] As we will see, during Vatican II, such intransigent preconciliar networks would become highly active in the *Coetus internationalis patrum*, and some of them would abandon the Catholic Church after the council.

2.5. *The "nouvelle théologie"*

The *nouvelle théologie* movement ("new theology movement") was in fact a French-based movement, which is closely connected with the biblical movement, and therefore cannot be understood without knowing the background of the modernist crisis.[56] The influence of early twentieth-century writings such as Lagrange's *Méthode historique*, cannot be denied, but there is a crucial difference: Whereas often Modernism arose out of the influence of "secular science" and in some cases came to critique the Thomist paradigm from the outside, this was not the case with the so-called *nouvelle théologie*. The desire of the "new theologians" to reconnect Catholic theology with contemporary faith experience and concrete everyday life forced them to rethink theology, yet now departing from Thomism. They did so by trying to reform neo-scholasticism from within, adapting the Church's paradigm to contemporary needs and insights. Their *ressourcement* efforts obliged them to take the prevailing neo-Thomism—*in casu* Roman neo-scholasticism—as its point of departure, and more specifically by returning to its historical roots in Thomas Aquinas himself. This implied a return, in the first instance, to the historical Thomas and his thought and no longer a scholastic use of Thomas as a point of reference. They abandoned a system which was called both *Konklusionstheologie* (conclusion theology, referring to the scholastic-mathematical system

---

[55] On the French seminary in Rome, see the landmark study by Paul Airiau, *Le séminaire français de Rome du P. Le Floch, 1904–1927* (Paris, 2003). Also see the contribution of Philippe J. Roy, 'Le Coetus Internationalis Patrum et le schéma De Sacra Liturgia au concile Vatican II,' *Questions Liturgiques* (2013), forthcoming.

[56] On the *nouvelle théologie*, its context and implications, see Jürgen Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology: Inheritor of Modernism, Precursor of Vatican II* (London – New York, 2010); Hans Boersma, *Nouvelle Theologie and Sacramental Ontology: A Return to Mystery* (Oxford, 2009); *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology*, ed. Gabriel Flynn and Paul D. Murray (Oxford, 2012).

of deduction) and *Denzingertheologie* (Denzinger theology, referring to the collection of Roman texts). This was increasingly transformed into a more profound and more extensive return to the sources, namely the historical sources of the faith as such: the Bible and the Church Fathers.

The bipolar starting point of the *nouvelle théologie* can be located in 1935, when the French Dominican Yves Congar, professor at the Dominican study center *Le Saulchoir*, published an opinion piece entitled *Déficit de la théologie*.[57] Congar used the piece to formulate his critique of the then current practice of theology, which had become little more than a technical matter and had long lost sight of its relationship with the faith and life of ordinary men and women. He compared neo-scholastic theology to a "wax mask" lacking genuine connection with reality; and he called for a theology rooted in faith and life, as he made clear in a second article published in June of the same year.

Congar's confrere Marie-Dominique Chenu likewise published an article on the *Position de la théologie*, which served as a blueprint for the third chapter of Chenu's 1937 book *Une école de théologie*.[58] In line with Ambroise Gardeil, the founder of *Le Saulchoir*, Chenu called for the reformation of Catholic theology. For Chenu, theology was "faith *in statu scientiae*" and "faith in its intellectual mode." He insisted that it was necessary to take seriously the historical and the contextual in order to engage in authentic theology. This was a logical consequence of the primary characteristic of faith as a reality made concrete in everyday life. With this vision in mind, Chenu fashioned a project together with Congar and Henri-Marie Féret, focusing on the history of theology and the imbedded character of faith.[59]

A year after the appearance of *Une école de théologie*, the Belgian Dominican Louis Charlier published his *Essai sur le problème théologique*.[60] Charlier's work caused something of a stir and was the subject of a considerable number of reviews, because it had widely stimulated much serious reflection. Quite in the line with Newman and the nineteenth-century

---

[57] Yves Congar, 'Déficit de la théologie,' *Sept* (January 18, 1935).

[58] Marie-Dominique Chenu, 'Position de la théologie,' *RSPT* 24 (1935), 232–57; *Une école de théologie: Le Saulchoir* (Kain, pro manuscripto, 1937), republished in *Une école de théologie: le Saulchoir*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo et al. [Théologies] (Paris, 1985), pp. 91–173, esp. the chapter on theology, 129–50.

[59] Cf. Michael Quisinsky, *Geschichtlicher Glaube in einer geschichtlichen Welt: Der Beitrag von M.-D. Chenu, Y. Congar und H.-M. Féret zum II. Vaticanum* [Dogma und Geschichte 6] (Berlin, 2007).

[60] Louis Charlier, *Essai sur le problème théologique* [Bibliothèque orientations: Section scientifique 1] (Thuillies, 1938).

Catholic *Tübinger Schule*, Charlier distinguished between the *côté conceptuel* (conceptual dimension) of revelation and the *côté réel* (real dimension) thereof. Charlier himself was convinced that revelation was in the first instance a living reality and only in the second instance a collection of concepts. The joint relegation of Chenu's work and Charlier's book to the church's Index of Prohibited Books in February 1942 marks the end of the first phase of the *nouvelle théologie*, led almost entirely by members from the Dominican Order.

Within the already sketched context of the relegation of both works to the Index, the expression *nouvelle théologie* was used for the first time, by Pietro Parente, who justified the condemnation in *L'Osservatore Romano* in precisely these terms: Parente argued that both works had brought neo-scholasticism into discredit with their focus on the subject, personal experience, religious sentiment, and the notion of development in theology.[61]

The fact that the Dominicans clearly played the lead role in this first phase (1935–42) is hardly surprising when one considers that they were the pre-eminent successors to the work of Thomas Aquinas. In this sense, the first phase can be identified with a Thomistic *ressourcement* wherein neo-scholasticism was not abandoned completely, rather it was supplemented in an initial step before proceeding in a second step to a theological *ressourcement*.

In the second phase of the *nouvelle théologie*, the Dominicans withdraw into the background and the Jesuits took the lead, in particular some Jesuits in Paris and in the study centre at Lyon-Fourvière. The beginning of this phase can be seen in a trilogy of publications. The first was Henri Bouillard's doctoral dissertation, published in 1944 as *Conversion et grâce chez Saint Thomas d'Aquin*, in which Bouillard claims that "a theology that lacks topicality is a false theology."[62] Such statements could only be interpreted as an attack on neo-scholasticism. Second came an article by Jean Daniélou published in 1946 under the title *Les orientations présentes de la pensée religieuse*.[63] Daniélou insisted that a return to the Bible, liturgy, and patristics was to be preferred above a theology that owed its existence to a single medieval theologian. The commotion around that article led to his discharge as editor of the periodical *Études*. Finally, we

---

[61] Pietro Parente, 'Nuove tendenze teologiche,' *Oss. Rom.* (February 9–10, 1942), p. 1.

[62] Henri Bouillard, *Conversion et grâce chez saint Thomas d'Aquin: Étude historique* [Théologie 1] (Paris, 1944).

[63] Jean Daniélou, 'Les orientations présentes de la pensée religieuse,' *Études* 79 (1946), 5–21.

should mention Henri de Lubac's *Surnaturel*, which presented an essay on the Augustinian doctrine of grace in which contact between Catholic theology and contemporary thinking could be restored, and which also criticized neo-scholasticism.[64] The desire to inject theology with a new lease of life and its associated return to the sources of faith inspired the Jesuits to establish the series *Sources chrétiennes* and *Théologie* in 1942 and 1944 respectively. Both were based at the house of studies maintained by the order in Lyon—on the hill of Fourvière overlooking the city of Lyon. Scholars like Fergus Kerr argue that Henri de Lubac's book *Surnaturel* brought about one of the greatest crises twentieth-century Catholic theology had ever faced.[65] In light of the contributions of Bouillard, Daniélou and de Lubac, one should also reflect on the position and work of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. His work as paleologue and philosopher, brought in an anthropological emphasis, which was considered so dangerous by Rome that publication and reading of his works was banned for some time.

Thomistic *ressourcement* was not stifled in 1942, but acquired new impetus and dynamism in this period. This second phase can be described as theological *ressourcement*: a return to the sources of Christian faith as fundamental points of reference and inspiration for Catholic theology. This differed greatly from the neo-scholastic tradition, which had inherited the nineteenth century focus on the Roman Catholic hierarchy as its main point of reference. Via the integration of the historical perspective, theology was called upon to cross the boundaries from a supra-historical "*magisteriumism*" to an historically oriented source theology. De Lubac, Daniélou and the Fourvière Jesuits soon met with harsh opposition, with the reputed neo-scholastic and Roman Dominican friar Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange on the forefront. In February 1947 he published his article *La nouvelle théologie, où va-t-elle?*, the text of which contained his answer: the *nouvelle théologie* is a new kind of modernism.[66] Garrigou-Lagrange believed that the weapons used in the past to attack Modernism should be used once again to suppress the *nouvelle théologie*. Occasioned by Garrigou's article, the Jesuit general Jean-Baptiste Janssens set up an inquiry

[64] Henri de Lubac, *Surnaturel: Études historiques* [Théologie 8] (Paris, 1946, republished in 1991). On the importance of Lubac' thinking, also see the article by Joseph A. Komonchak, 'Theology at Mid-Century: The Example of Henri de Lubac,' *TS* 51 (1990), 579–602.

[65] Kerr, *After Aquinas*, p. 134.

[66] Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange, 'La nouvelle théologie où va-t-elle?,' *Angelicum* 23 (1946), 126–145.

into the orthodoxy of Lyon-Fourvière under the leadership of Édouard Dhanis, also a Belgian and a confidant of Janssens.[67] In June 1950, this resulted in the transfer of Henri de Lubac and Henri Bouillard from Lyon to Paris. On top of this, a heated debate raged between the Toulouse and Roman Dominicans (in the *Revue thomiste* and *Angelicum*) and the Jesuits of Lyon (in the *Recherches de science religieuse*).[68]

Finally, Pius XII intervened during an address to the participants of the Jesuit General Congregation on September 17, 1946. The pope insisted that the time had come to call a halt to discussion. Five days later, he addressed the General Chapter of the Dominicans. His words ultimately fell on deaf ears; and actually they even provided the debate with new ammunition and "publicity." Pius XII finally promulgated *Humani generis* in 1950. This encyclical can be understood as Rome's final defence of neo-scholasticism as a normative framework determining the orthodoxy of theology. The spirit of *Humani generis* ran parallel with *Pascendi dominici gregis*. Strictly speaking, the encyclical did not mention the *nouvelle théologie*, although it condemned thirteen topics defined as "new."[69] This second phase (1942–50) too was concluded like the first, with Roman censure.

Nevertheless, from 1950 up to the eve of the Second Vatican Council, this critical current remained present in Catholic theology, now characterized by its internationalization. The *nouvelle théologie* pressed on in the Netherlands, for example, with scholars such as Edward Schillebeeckx and Piet Schoonenberg, and in the German-speaking world with theologians like Karl Rahner and Hans Urs von Balthasar. In France itself, however, the *nouvelle théologie* was as good as paralyzed. Nevertheless, the international spreading of its ideas created a broad and supportive foundation for what would happen at Vatican II.

---

[67] On this episode, see Jürgen Mettepenningen and Karim Schelkens, 'Quod immutabile est, nemo turbet et moveat: Les rapports entre H. de Lubac et le P. général J.B. Janssens dans les années 1946–1948 à propos des documents inédits,' *CrSt* 29 (2008), 139–72.

[68] See Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology*, pp. 101–14.

[69] Cf. Étienne Fouilloux, '"Nouvelle théologie" et théologie nouvelle, 1930–1960,' in *L'histoire religieuse en France et Espagne*, ed. Benoît Pellistrandi [Collection de la casa Velázquez 87] (Madrid, 2004), pp. 411–25.

CHAPTER FIVE

VATICAN II: THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES

1. *Calling for Aggiornamento*

After a conclave of four days, on October 28, 1958, Pius XII's successor was elected. The then Patriarch of Venice, Cardinal Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, had been chosen as the main candidate next to other *papabili* such as the Armenian Patriarch Grégoire-Pierre Agagianian. At the moment of his election to the pontificate, Roncalli was already 76 years old, and the general expectation was that he would be a transition pope, not making many important decisions, and distracting from some of the more painful moments of the previous pontificate.[1]

The world political situation, at the start of the new pontificate, is what it inherited from Pius XII: the Cold War. In the Western European territories the effects of the post World War II Marshall Plan were readily apparent. There were stronger economies and an overall economic growth in the Western World. On the other side of the global political spectrum, behind the Iron Curtain, the situation was quite different. Communism under Stalin's rule had become increasingly hostile against all religious practice and in particular against people not belonging to the Soviet controlled Russian Orthodox Church. In comparison with the Second World War, less armed conflicts were seen, but the risk of an atomic war was ever imminent. Under Joseph Stalin's successor Nikita Khrushchev, the Cold War tensions remained strong and threatening; and the arms race between the world's political super powers accelerated.

Roncalli had had some experiences with the Eastern European situation, having been papal nuncio in Bulgaria, which would help him develop his own approach, when two major political crises occurred during his pontificate. First, in 1961 the Berlin Crisis led to the building of the

[1] Cf. Giuseppe Alberigo, *Dalla Laguna al Tevere: Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli da San Marco à San Pietro* [TRSR: N.S. 25] (Bologna, 2000); Giuseppe Alberigo, *Jean XXIII devant l'histoire* (Paris, 1989); also see the excellent article by Victor Conzemius, 'Mythes et contre-mythes autour de Jean XXIII,' *CrSt* 10 (1989), 553–77.

Berlin Wall. Perhaps even worse, in the week of October 22 to 29, 1962, the Cuban Missile Crisis brought the world to the brink of a third world war. That October U.S. intelligence had discovered the presence of Soviet nuclear warheads in Cuba, close to the United States coastline. This made the threat of communist nuclear power extremely strong and political tensions between Washington and Moscow rose to a peak.[2]

In the midst of this situation, due to the efforts of people such as the American journalist Norman Cousins—who devoted a monograph to the story[3]—and the Belgian Dominican Félix Morlion, Pope John XXIII issued a radio intervention calling for both parties to avoid nuclear warfare and to respect the wellbeing of all humankind. This speech was not only published in the *New York Times*, but also in the Soviet Party periodical *Pravda*, and made a deep impression on both the Roman Catholic U.S. President John F. Kennedy and the Communist Party leader Nikita Khrushchev. Pope John XXIII appeared open for dialogue with anyone who cared for the wellbeing of all humankind. This attitude, ill-received within Roman Curia circles, immediately illustrated the change of course taken by the Vatican in its relations with the outside world. Unlike Pope Pius XII and his predecessors, John XXIII had refrained from an aggressive condemnation of communists. In 1963, this would result in Pope John's receiving the *Balzan Peace Prize*. He even granted a private audience to Khrushchev's son-in-law, Adzhubei. Both events were considered fairly controversial within the milieu of the Italian cardinals. As a consequence of the pope's attitude, Nikita Khrushchev decided to make his own personal gesture and liberated the Greek Catholic Ukrainian Patriarch Joseph Slipyj, who had been exiled for almost eighteen years.[4]

On January 4, 1963, Pope John XXIII was chosen "Man of the Year" by *Time Magazine*,[5] and his peace efforts continued even further: From

---

[2] Giancarlo Zizola, *Giovanni XXIII: La fede e la politica* (Rome, 2000). Also see Roland Flamini's book *Pope, Premier, President: The Cold War Summit That Never Was* (New York NY, 1980).

[3] Norman Cousins, *The Improbable Triumvirate: An Asterisk to the Hopeful Year 1962–1963* (New York, 1972).

[4] On Metropolitan Slipyj, see the book by Jaroslav Pelikan, *Confessor Between East and West: A Portrait of Ukrainian Cardinal Josyf Slipyj* (Grand Rapids MI, 1990). On the diplomatic gestures behind his release, see Karim Schelkens, 'Vatican Diplomacy After the Cuban Missile Crisis: New Light on the Release of Josyf Slipyj,' *Catholic Historical Review* 98 (2011), 679–712.

[5] *Time Magazine* (January 4, 1963), Cover. John XXIII had already previously figured on the cover of the famous magazine, but him being elected as "Man of the Year" created a novelty. No pope had ever been granted that honour. The cover story noted, with regard

the moment of the council's opening onward, the pope had been making preparations for an encyclical devoted to the matter of world peace. He confided the drafting of the document to the Italian theologian Pietro Pavan, and finally, on April 11, 1963, he promulgated his views on peace and the rights of the individual to seek the truth, without coercion, in his encyclical *Pacem in terris*.[6]

2. *Vatican II: Convocation and Procedures*

Undoubtedly, the most striking decision made by John XXIII was his decision, communicated to the college of cardinals gathered in the Basilica of St Paul-Outside-the-Walls in Rome.[7] On that occasion, merely three months after his election to the chair of St Peter, on January 25, 1959, John XXIII communicated his desires to convoke an ecumenical council, call a diocesan synod for the Diocese of Rome, and to revise the Code of Canon Law.[8] Most of the cardinals present were absolutely stupefied. Some were soon convinced that such an ecumenical council would take only two or three months to complete its mission. This, however, was still

---

to Vatican II that "history has a long eye, and it is quite possible that in her vision 1962's most fateful rendez-vous took place in the world's most famous church—having lived for years in men's hearts and minds."

[6] John XXIII, 'Pacem in Terris (April 11, 1963),' *AAS* 55 (1963), 257–304. On the background and origins of this encyclical, see Alberto Melloni, *Pacem in terris: Storia dell'ultima enciclica di Papa Giovanni* (Rome and Bari, 2010).

[7] See the pope's speech in *AD* I/1, pp. 3–6. In this speech he pronounced the following words: Venerabili Fratelli e Diletti Figli! Pronunciamo innanzi a voi, certo tremando un poco di commozione, ma insieme con umile risolutezza di proposito, il nome e la proposta della duplice celebrazione: di un Sinodo Diocesano per l'Urbe, e di un Concilio Ecumenico per la Chiesa universale. Per voi, Venerabili Fratelli e Diletti Figli, non occorrono illustrazioni copiose circa la significazione storica e giuridica di queste due proposte. Esse condurranno felicemente all'auspicato e atteso aggiornamento del Codice di Diritto Canonico, che dovrebbe accompagnare e coronare questi due saggi di pratica applicazione dei provvedimenti di ecclesiastica disciplina, che lo Spirito del Signore Ci verrà suggerendo lungo la via. La prossima promulgazione del Codice di Diritto Orientale ci dà il preannunzio di questi avvenimenti.

Although it has often been claimed that the announcement was deliberately neglected in the Vatican's official newspaper, this would seem incorrect. See the article devoted to the announcement that appeared on the front page of *L'Osservatore Romano*, under the header 'Storici avvenimenti per la vita della Chiesa annunciati da Sua Santità.' See *Oss. Rom.* 21 (January 26–7, 1959), p. 1. On the second page the paper listed the names of seventeen cardinals present during the public event.

[8] Alberto Melloni, 'Prodromi e preparazione del discorso d'annuncio del Vaticano II (Questa festiva ricorrenza), 25 gennaio 1959,' *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 28 (1992), 607–43.

to be seen, for the procedure and the organization of the council itself would become very important.

Before addressing the actual content and debates of Vatican II and some of its major decisions, we will elaborate a bit on the procedural aspects of this council.[9]

As of the January 1959 communication, the preparation for Vatican II was officially initiated. This preparation itself, however, would take three entire years and last almost as long as the council. These years in themselves constitute an important and often neglected transition period in twentieth-century Catholicism. Laying out the plans for this first new council since Pius IX's First Vatican Council required two phases: the ante-preparatory and the preparatory.[10]

2.1. *The Ante-Preparatory Phase*

The ante-preparatory phase was the first moment of preparation. In fact, as the term indicates, it concerned the preparations for the preparation. In this period, one single ante-preparatory commission was active and had to prepare the council's agenda. This in itself constituted something of a novelty in comparison with former councils. Most of the previous councils had been convoked around a pre-given agenda, a problem at hand, which the pope decided to treat by gathering his bishops. This classical "deductive" *modus convocandi* of a council was abandoned by Pope John XXIII. The pope did not at all set out a detailed agenda for Vatican II. Rather, he left this to the world church itself; and in order to achieve this he charged the ante-preparatory commission to send an open letter of

---

[9] The most elaborate study of Vatican II up to date is *The History of Vatican II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak, 5 Vols. (New York and Louvain, 1995–2006); These five volumes cover the entire council, from the announcement to its closure: Vol. 1: *Announcing and Preparing Vatican Council II: Toward a New Era in Catholicism*; Vol. 2: *The Formation of the Council's Identity: First Period and Intersession, October 1962–September 1963*; Vol. 3: *The Mature Council: Second Period and Intersession, September 1963–September 1964*; Vol. 4: *Church as Communion: Third Period and Intersession, September 1964–September 1965*; Vol. 5: *The Council and the Transition: Fourth Period and the End of the Council, September–December 1965*.

[10] This periodization is commonly accepted and builds upon Vincenzo Carbone's edition of the council acts. These, for the period from 1959 to 1962, are published as *Acta et Documenta Concilio Oecumenico Vaticano II apparando*; Series I: *Antepraeparatoria*; Series II: *Praeparatoria* (Vatican City, 1960–95) [henceforth *AD*]; and for the council period, the acts are consultable in the *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II* (Vatican City, 1970–99) [henceforth *AS*]. On the preparations in general, see *Verso il concilio Vaticano II, 1960–1962: Passagi e problemi della preparazione conciliare*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Alberto Melloni [TRSR: N.S. 11] (Genova, 1993).

invitation to all Catholic bishops, all superiors of large religious orders and congregations, and to the heads of pontifical universities and faculties. The letter simply invited them to send in their "wishes" (in Latin: *vota*) for the topics to be addressed by the upcoming council.[11] As a result, a multitude of thousands of *vota* arrived in Rome by the summer of 1959, all greatly varying in concerns and issues. The *vota* ranged as well from documents consisting of a few phrases, to full-fledged treatises of over a hundred pages. On the level of content, almost anything that one can think of was there: questions on the liturgy, on ecumenism, on communism, on social issues, on revelation, on ecclesiology, lay apostolate, mariology, the Eucharist, Catholic marriage, the importance of Latin, etc. Some *vota* called for a reinforcement of neo-scholastic thinking; others asked for an overall abolishment of the same neo-scholastic framework. In itself, the collection of *vota* offers a very rich and detailed overview of the richness and diversity of Roman Catholicism on the eve of the council.

The ante-preparatory commission was then charged with cataloguing all of these *vota*, organizing them per topic, and leading them through a rather complicated bottleneck process. This, ultimately, would result in a list of 55 subjects to be treated, divided over some eleven general categories, and presented in what was dubbed the *Analyticus conspectus*.[12] On the basis of that list, a list of questions to be proposed to the preconciliar commissions was equally prepared,[13] and ultimately a minimal consensus was reached with regard to the council's future agenda. It would need to deal with a redefining of the role of the bishops, a deepened understanding of liturgical reform, a restoration of the permanent diaconate.[14] Other than that, a variety of topics would be raised.

2.2. *The Preparatory Phase*

On June 5, 1960, the motu proprio *Superno Dei Nutu* was issued by John XXIII, constituting an important moment in conciliar history.[15] With his *motu proprio* the pope inaugurated a new era of council preparations

[11] The original content of the letter, signed by Cardinal Tardini on June 18, 1959, is found in *AD* I/2, 1:x–xi.

[12] This overview took up two volumes in the *AD* I/1–2.

[13] For the *Quaestiones commissionibus praeparatoriis oecumenici Concilii Vaticanae II positae*, as the full title goes, see, the *AD* II/2, 1:408–15.

[14] Philippe Chenaux, *Il Concilio Vaticano II* (Rome, 2012), p. 45.

[15] John XXIII, 'Superno Dei nutu (June 5, 1960),' *AAS* 52 (1960), 433–7. By July 18, 1960, a first list of members to the preconciliar commissions was made public in *Oss. Rom.*, 100/166 (18–9 July 1960), p. 1.

and set up a larger organizational structure, to some extent comparable to the preparation structure for Vatican I, which had immediately started out with the commission work after Pius IX had defined its agenda. The new structure, established now, would consist of no less than ten commissions.[16] These preparatory commissions—doubling the number of commissions preparing Vatican I—would constitute the conciliar counterpart for the existing congregations of the Roman Curia; and they would also be led by the respective prefects of these dicasteries.[17] This implied that the organization of the council would rely greatly on the Vatican administration, still active in its governance of the world church. The commissions's composition was left quite open, giving ample freedom for the presidents and secretaries of these pre-conciliar commissions to appoint their own members. This meant that the actual preparations of pre-conciliar schemata (prepared as the basis for conciliar debate, similarly to the Vatican I procedure) and their content would be, to a large degree, in the hands of the members of the Roman Curia.[18] One commission is rather unique here, for it was a new organ, not identifiable with any curial congregation: the Commission on the Lay Apostolate. Finally, on top of these particular commissions, a Central Commission was added, responsible for the coordination of the work of the aforementioned commissions, and for the drafting of the council regulations.

At the same time, the *motu proprio* officially created three secretariats: a Secretariat for the Media, a Secretariat for Technical Affairs, and a Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity (SPCU). The latter was headed by Cardinal Augustin Bea,[19] and had Johannes Willebrands as its secretary. This would be the first official Catholic organ set up by the Vatican to engage in ecumenism; and that alone indicated its importance. Moreover, it would be in continuation with the efforts of a group

---

[16] The Theological Commission; Commission on the Bishops; Commission on the Religious; Commission on the Missions; Commission on the Discipline of the Sacraments; Commission on the Oriental Churches; Commission on the Lay Apostolate; Commission on the Seminaries and Universities; Commission on the Liturgy; Commission on the Discipline of the Clergy.

[17] Andrea Riccardi, *Preparare il Concilio: Papa e Curia alla vigilia del Vaticano II*, in *Le Deuxième concile du Vatican, 1959–1965*), pp. 181–205. Also see Étienne Fouilloux, 'Les théologiens romains à la veille de Vatican II,' in *Histoire et théologie*, ed. Jean-Dominique Durand (Paris, 1994).

[18] Cf. *Experiences, Organisations and Bodies at Vatican II*, ed. Maria Teresia Fattori and Alberto Melloni [IT 21] (Louvain, 1999).

[19] Stjepan Schmidt, *Augustin Bea: Der Kardinal der Einheit* (Graz, Vienna, Cologne, 1989).

of Catholics belonging to the aforementioned "Catholic Conference for Ecumenical Questions."[20] Now, many of its members would carry on their activities with an official mandate; and the other Christian churches and communities would have an "official address" for communicating with the Roman Catholic Church.[21] This new ecumenical organ had to collaborate with the pre-conciliar commissions. These had received the list of "*quaestiones*" prepared by the ante-preparatory commission; and, on the basis of that, the commissions would start drafting schemata for council discussions. Eventually, this resulted in a massive list of some seventy schemata, many of which would never be discussed. The SPCU then had to determine whether these schemata were sufficiently "ecumenical" in nature; but another problem arose as well. The Secretariat for Christian Unity did not have the rank of a commission; and on the basis of this juridical argument, the pre-conciliar Theological Commission consistently refused to co-operate with it. This predicament would lead to much struggle and debate during the council itself, as we will later clarify.

Another charge of the SPCU was to invite representatives from non-Catholic churches to be present at the council. Such an invitation—against the background of an "ecumenism of return"—had already been sent out before Vatican I by Pius IX, with negative results. This time however, due to the impressive network of inter-confessional contacts and preconciliar experiences from the SPCU-members, John XXIII succeeded, even though it took serious efforts to convince some of the Orthodox patriarchates. As his personal notes indicate, Willebrands had to travel to Istanbul and to Moscow to smoothen relationships and to clarify the council's agenda.[22] Ultimately, non-Catholic observers were sent by a vast variety of orthodox churches and reformed communities—allowing for the presence in Rome of prominent figures like Oscar Cullmann and George Lindbeck—, as well as observers from the side of the Geneva World Council of Churches, such as Lukas Vischer and Nikos Nissiotis.

---

[20] On the importance of this preconciliar organisation, see Peter De Mey, 'Précurseur du Secrétariat pour l'Unité: Le travail oecuménique de la Conférence Catholique pour les questions oecuméniques, 1952–1963,' in *La théologie catholique entre intransigeance et renouveau*, pp. 271–308.

[21] Mauro Velati, *Una difficile transizione: Il cattolicesimo tra unionismo ed ecumenismo, 1952–1964* [TRSR: N.S. 16] (Bologna, 1996); and Velati, 'Un indirizzo a Roma. La nascità del Segretariato per l'unità dei cristiani, 1959–1960,' in *Il Vaticano fra attese e celebrazione*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo [TRSR: N.S. 13] (Bologna, 1995), pp. 83–4.

[22] *Les agendas conciliaires de Mgr. J. Willebrands: Secrétaire du secrétariat pour l'Unité des chrétiens*, ed. Leo Declerck [IT 31] (Louvain, 2009).

The preparatory years formed a long and important time, as the transition period between the era of the pre-conciliar movements and the conciliar church. Gradually, major elements proposed by the aforementioned movements would be integrated in some of the schemas; while, at the same time, much of the lingering neo-scholastic paradigm was still found in the pre-conciliar schemata. Recent studies tend to demonstrate how this rendered them more complex than is often thought. Certainly something that warrants further study.[23] Before dealing with the actual course of conciliar events and debates, one more issue must be addressed here: Modern technology.

2.3. *A Mediatized Council*

When compared to the world of 1869, the world at the preparation and launching of Vatican II had changed dramatically. The industrial revolution had had its consequences, both negative and positive. Bishops could now arrive in Rome by airplane, train, bus or car, and no longer in horse-drawn carriages. Vatican II occurred at a moment when the Soviets and the U.S. were not only entangled in a nuclear arms race; but they were also in a competition to put the first human on the moon. These developments, at the end of the nineteenth century, had been unimaginable.

International mobility also had its impact on the council, making it much less Euro-centric. With relative ease council fathers from all continents could attend Vatican II; and by October 1962, they gathered in Rome, arriving from all corners of the globe. The assembly itself would also be much larger. Vatican I had counted some 800 council fathers; for Vatican II that number was tripled. Vatican II would be attended by about 2,500 bishops, hundreds of theological experts, and . . . the world press.

Radio and television had not only changed the world and society; but they changed as well the very nature of the council: lay people from all over the world could follow the conciliar events live on television.[24] The council organization itself involved the setup of a secretariat dealing with the media, offering daily press releases, and soon lobby groups of Catholic press members would join in what was called the *Rencontres internationaux des informateurs religieux*, trying to weigh in on the council's evolution via the media. And finally, technical progress entered the very council

[23] See *La théologie catholique entre intransigeance et renouveau*.

[24] Cf. Jérôme Coutard, 'La presse et le concile Vatican II: Une histoire de représentations,' in *Vatican II au Canada: Enracinement et réception*, pp. 245–60.

hall, with microphone installations allowing the bishops to be heard by their colleagues, with headphones offering simultaneous translations for the non-Catholic observers (not for Catholic bishops, who were supposed to follow everything in Latin!) and ultimately with magnetic voting cards and counting machines provided by Olivetti, facilitating the conciliar voting process. In sum, the council would not only have the Roman Catholic Church enter the modern world; but the modern world entered the Roman Catholic council.

3. *The Council under John XXIII*

After the closure of the preparatory period, the Second Vatican Council officially opened on October 11, 1962.[25] On that day, John XXIII held his opening address *Gaudet mater ecclesia*,[26] which in itself constituted a key moment for the council. This pontifical allocution made abundantly clear what the pope's intentions were, and, negatively put, what he did not expect the council to do. In his address, broadcast live on radio and television, the pope stated that Vatican II would have to be a pastoral council rather than a doctrinal council. Clarifying this, John XXIII expressed his concern that the council would present the old doctrines in a new way, adapted to modern needs. For this he used the Italian word: "*aggiornamento*," a term that had occurred in various previous speeches of the pope.[27] At the same time John XXIII made clear that he did not, then, expect the council fathers to declare new doctrinal statements, nor did he expect the council to issue condemnations. Referring to "prophets of doom," the pope made it clear that he wished the council to steer away from a defensive and condemnatory style and adopt an open and welcoming discourse.[28] Precisely this stress on a new and contemporary discourse was crucial,

[25] In the past decades, litterally thousands of studies have been devoted to Vatican II. For a vast survey of literature on this domain, see the recent volume by Philippe J. Roy, *Bibliographie du Concile Vatican II* [Atti e documenti 34] (Vatican City, 2012).

[26] The acts of the entire solemn opening session of the council, as well as the speech *Gaudet mater ecclesia* are found in *AS* I/1, pp. 155–203.

[27] On the use and the importance of the term *aggiornamento*, also in light of Vatican II hermeneutics, see Michael Bredeck, *Das Zweite Vatikanum als Konzil des Aggiornamento: Zur hermeneutischer Grundlegung einer theologischen Konzilsinterpretation* [Paderborner theologische Studien 48] (Paderborn, 2007).

[28] Cf. the analysis of the speech by Alberto Melloni, 'L'allocuzione Gaudet Mater Ecclesia: Sinossi critica dell'allocuzione,' in *Fede Traditione Profezia: Studi su Giovanni XXIII e sul Vaticano II* (Brescia, 1984), pp. 223–83.

and in his address, the pope implicitly took up the theological currents for renewal, advocating the possibility of a development of dogma. Other than Pius XII before him, this pope carefully distinguished between the eternal truth itself, contained in the "deposit of faith," and the expression and presentation of that truth, which is subject to rephrasing according to contemporary needs and forms of thought. Hereby Pope John XXIII—a former papal nuncio in France during the time the *nouvelle théologie* was developed there—implicitly adopted a theological-philosophical standpoint which neared that of the protagonists of the *nouvelle théologie*; and he set aside the identification of formula and expression so dear to neo-scholastic philosophical realism.

In all of this, it became clear that Pope John XXIII was well aware of the attitude the Roman-Catholic Church had developed since Pius IX reacted against the revolutions of 1848. A century of conflict with modernity was seemingly set aside, and the pope invited Catholics to pursue a modern integration of the Christian faith. Applying the distinction between truth and formulation of the truth as a principle, John XXIII went on to state that he wanted his council to be an *ecumenical* council, in the broadest sense of the word, and addressing members of other churches—representatives of which were present at the opening celebrations.

This initial moment would prove to be of lasting significance; and the papal speech would remain a constant reference point in conciliar interventions, throughout the entire duration of Vatican II. Two days later, another important and highly significant event occurred, even before the council began officially discussing the schemata. On the first official "General Congregation" of the fathers in the conciliar aula (Saint Peter's basilica) a vote was organized to elect the members of the "new" conciliar commissions.[29] For each of the ten commissions some sixteen names were to be filled in on blank cards, thus the bishops had to come up with a hundred and sixty names. In order to safeguard the continuity of the commission composition with the pre-conciliar period, the General Secretariat of the Council, led by Monsignor Felici, distributed a list of members

[29] On the events of this day, see *AS* I/1, pp. 207–8. For a detailed account of the importance of the extraordinary second day of Vatican II, see Mathijs Lamberigts and Alois Greiler, 'Concilium episcoporum est: The Interventions of Liénart and Frings Revisited,' *ETL* 73 (1997), 54–71, and the additional study found in Leo Declerck and Mathijs Lamberigts, 'Le rôle de l'épiscopat belge dans l'élection des commissions conciliaires en octobre 1962,' in *La Raison par Quatre Chemins: En Hommage* à *Claude Troisfontaines*, ed. Jean Leclercq [Bibliothèque Philosophique de Louvain 73] (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2007), pp. 279–305.

of the pre-conciliar commissions. The most natural thing to do would be to copy these names, but soon protests arose from Cardinals Achille Liénart and Joseph Frings. They called for a postponement of the vote so that the council fathers could become better acquainted with each other. The demand was granted by the French Cardinal Eugène Tisserant—the former prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches,[30] then acting as chair of the Council's presidium. The result was that in the next few days an officious international exchange took place in the city of Rome, with national episcopal conferences spreading their lists with suggested candidates among the houses of other episcopal conferences. When, on October 16, 1962, the voting round was re-done, the result was that the composition of the conciliar commissions differed greatly from the pre-conciliar commissions. From the very outset, therefore and through solid procedural means, the council was put into the hands of the world's bishops, thus changing the council's *mécanique politique* right from scratch,[31] and increasing the role of episcopal conferences in the conciliar dynamics.[32]

3.1. *The First Period Debates: Liturgy, Revelation and the Church*

Only on October 22, 1962, did the first conciliar debate begin; and it was devoted to the "Schema on the Liturgy." This project consisted of eight chapters.[33] In the debate that followed, most council fathers intervened regarding some of the major issues that had already been imminent and prepared by the liturgical movement, and in general on the need for local adaptation of a liturgical practice that in most cases still followed the tridentine liturgy. Issues debated therefore were the possibility of introducing the vernacular, the concelebration of priests, communion under both species, and needed reforms of the Breviary, the Missal, and the Ritual. An element of importance in this debate was the recognition of the authority of local episcopal conferences in dealing with the publication of liturgical texts. In general, many fathers favored the document as a whole, as a

---

[30] On Tisserant, see the biography written by Étienne Fouilloux, *Eugène cardinal Tisserant, 1884–1972* (Paris, 2011).

[31] The term was coined by the French historian Philippe Levillain, in his book *La Mécanique politique de Vatican II: La majorité et l'unanimité dans un concile* (Paris, 1975).

[32] The latter point was significantly made by Roberto de Mattei, *Il Concilio Vaticano II: Una storia mai scritta* (Turin, 2010), p. 210.

[33] 1. General principles for the promotion and renewal of the liturgy; 2. On the mystery of the eucharist; 3. On the sacraments and sacramentals; 4. On the divine office; 5. On the liturgical year; 6. On liturgical furnishings; VII. On sacred Music; and 8. On sacred art.

good expression of the results of the liturgical movement. Notwithstanding some opposition and demands for a new introduction to the draft, the voting rounds at the end of the discussion turned out to be highly positive; and the principles drafted by the council's liturgical renewal were approved without significant trouble by a large majority of bishops.

The same did not go so well for the second council debate. On November 14, 1962 the "Schema on the Sources of Revelation" was presented to the council fathers,[34] the first text to be discussed that came from the Theological Commission. This schema consisted of five chapters, starting with a presentation of the twofold source of revelation and offering chapters on the Old Testament and the New Testament, on exegesis, and on the church's principles regarding the use of Scripture. Immediately upon the presentation of the text, a strong opposition began attacking the schema. The text was strongly criticized for representing an anti-modernist and neo-scholastic perspective on revelation. Basically, the draft presented revelation along the lines of Vatican I's *Dei filius*: as a set of revealed and supra-historical truths, communicated by God, and to be found in Scripture and in Tradition. The entire theological presentation was imbedded in a style and a language close to that of neo-scholastic exegetes and the footnotes made constant reference to magisterial documents on exegesis since Leo XIII (*Providentissimus Deus*,[35] *Lamentabili sane exitu*,[36] *Divino afflante spiritu*,[37] and *Humani generis*[38] played a key role as reference points). In the chapter on the New Testament, some condemnations issued earlier by the Holy Office were inserted; and it took a generally negative approach toward the positions defended by institutes such as the Pontifical Biblical Institute (still entangled in its controversy with the Lateran University).[39] The acceptance of an historical-critical study of the Bible was still at stake; and on occasion, aged council fathers such as Giovanni Basttista Peruzzo, a member of the Council's Doctrinal Commission,

---

[34] *AS* I/3, pp. 9–62. The chapters were: I. On the Twofold Source of Revelation; II. On Inspiration, Inerrancy and the Literary Composition of the Scriptures; III. On the Old Testament; IV. On the New Testament; V. On the Use of the Scriptures by the Church. The history of the schema and its importance have been addressed by Schelkens's aforementioned monograph *Catholic Theology of Revelation.*

[35] Leo XIII, 'Providentissimus Deus (November 18, 1893),' *ASS* 26 (1893–4), 269–93.

[36] Pius X, 'Lamentabili sane exitu (July 3, 1907),' *ASS* 40 (1907), 470–8.

[37] Pius XII, 'Divino afflante Spiritu (September 30, 1943),' *AAS* 35 (1943), 297–325.

[38] Pius XII, 'Humani generis (August 12, 1950),' *AAS* 42 (1950), 567–9

[39] On this quarrel between the two Roman Institutes, see Anthony Dupont and Karim Schelkens, 'Katholische Exegese vor dem Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil, 1960–1961,' *Zeitschrift fur katholische Theologie* 132 (2010), 1–24.

warned that Modernism was again on the rise and had to be defeated once and for all through a conciliar declaration.[40]

The major stumbling block in the schema, however, was not so much its view of Catholic exegesis, but rather the first chapter. In it, the aforementioned neo-scholastic view of revelation did not do justice to the perspectives on "tradition" that had been developed by the *nouvelle théologie*, nor to approaching the Scriptures in a critical way, as proposed by the biblical movement, now so strongly influenced by the *nouvelle théologie*'s interest in patristic thinking and its more historical-contextual vision regarding expressions of religious truth.[41] So different in perspective than the "Schema on the Liturgy," this draft was hardly in keeping with contemporary developments in theology and exegesis, and clearly ignored the more open perspective of the pre-conciliar movements. Moreover, proposing Scripture and Tradition as two distinct "sources" of divinely revealed truth, raised the danger of putting both in a concurrent position. This resulted in addressing the question in a typically post-Tridentine and Catholic apologetic manner, stressing that "tradition," as a collection of truths, was larger than Scripture, i.e.: that in tradition one can find truths that are not found in Sacred Scripture, implying therefore that Scripture is "materially insufficient" with regard to the knowledge of divine revelation.[42] All of this may sound rather technical, but the logic of it reaffirmed that the Protestant principle of *sola Scriptura*, as a sufficient basis for our comprehension of revelation, was thereby denounced.

This is an important fact. The schema was not addressing an "actual" view of revelation as the encounter of humankind with God in the person, acts, and words of Jesus Christ. The schema was also immediately rejected by many council fathers because it was non-ecumenical. On November 19, Bishop Emiel-Joseph De Smedt from Bruges held an intervention on behalf of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, explaining that the pre-conciliar Theological Commission had consistently denounced

---

[40] Peruzzo's speech is given in *AS* I/1, pp. 594–5.

[41] See Christoph Theobald, 'Le développement de la notion des "verités historiquement et logiquement connexes avec la Révélation" de Vatican I à Vatican II,' *CrSt* 21 (2000), 37–70.

[42] Around the same time, an altogether different approach to the notion of tradition appeared under the form of Yves Congar's two-volume work *Tradition et traditions*, 2 Vols. (Paris, 1962–3). Congar's books offered an alternative to the scholastic approach and were picked up by many theologians present at Vatican II.

all collaboration with the Secretariat.[43] He referred to the pope's opening speech to illustrate that the schema needed to be rejected and rewritten in more biblical and patristic language—which would signify the integration of the pastoral paradigm—and in a sensitive and conciliatory style, open to people from other Christian traditions. The opposition dug in its heels and this led to the first conciliar "doctrinal clash."[44] A majority of bishops sided with Bishop De Smedt and Cardinal Bea from the SPCU. The vocal opposition, a minority, included Cardinals Giuseppe Siri and Ernesto Ruffini, who staunchly defended the draft. In fact, once again thought frames that had been opposed since the late nineteenth century were played out. Only this time around, due to the better preparation of the bishops by contemporary theologians, who were busily organizing conferences throughout Rome and offering many a Catholic bishop a second theological education, a majority of conciliar bishops opted in favor of a reconciliation with modern thinking rather than a rejection.

This debate was an eye-opener for the entire council; but there was still more to it. On November 20, 1962, before the round of interventions had officially ended, Cardinal Ruffini presented the council fathers with a preliminary vote on a question phrased as follows: "Should the debate on the schema be interrupted?" Such phrasing caused confusion, because voting positively (*placet*) meant opposing the draft, while a negative vote (*non placet*) would imply that one accepted the schema. The result of the vote was 1,386 votes against the text, and 822 in favor. No two-third's majority was reached and the council found itself at an impasse. For the first time then, John XXIII intervened. He decided that the schema should be sent back to a commission for a general revision. His solution, in fact, created a novelty within the council. John created a "Mixed Commission on Divine Revelation," consisting of members of Cardinal Ottaviani's Doctrinal Commission as well as members from Cardinal Bea's SPCU.[45]

---

[43] De Smedt was bishop of Bruges from 1952 until 1984. For the speech, see *AS* I/3, pp. 184–7. The impact which this speech made on the Council Fathers has been described by Giuseppe Ruggieri, 'The First Doctrinal Clash,' in *History of Vatican II*, 2:258–9.

[44] Cf. Ruggieri, 'The First Doctrinal Clash,' in *History of Vatican II*, 2:233–66, there 233: The week which was devoted to discussion of the schema on the sources of revelation, represented a turning point that was decisive for the future of the council and therefore for the future of the Catholic Church itself.

[45] For John XXIII's reaction, see *AS* I/3, p. 259. John XXIII decided to establish a *Commissio mixta de divina revelatione* that was to take the schema *De fontibus* as a basis for its revisions. This decision turned out be a crucial precedent, leading to the establishment of other mixed commissions during the Council in an attempt to compensate for the lack of cooperation between the Council's preparatory bodies.

Throughout the council, this new organ would be made responsible for revising the schema time and again, finally resulting in the promulgation of the Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation *Dei verbum*, which in the end upheld a theology claiming that Christian revelation is essentially relational.[46] These first two conciliar debates made clear that the council was seriously engaged in receiving the pre-conciliar renewal movements and putting them on its agenda, with much effort and varying degrees of success.

The council's preparation, therefore, must to be traced back to much earlier than the "official" preparation starting in 1959; and many theologians, including protagonists such as Yves Congar and Edward Schillebeeckx, were very enthusiastic about John's papal intervention in the revelation debate.

After the painful discussion on the "Schema on the Sources," two other drafts came up for discussion: the "Schema on Communications Media" and the "Schema on Christian Unity." The latter was, however, not at all devoted to ecumenism in the contemporary sense of the word. Prepared by the Commission for the Oriental Churches, the schema, in fact, prominently dealth with the role and place of the Uniate churches. This too led to agitated reactions, as council fathers recalled Pope John's opening address and noted the presence of the non-Catholic observers present at the council. The discussion on this draft ended with the schema's being sent to yet another mixed commission, including representation from the SPCU, the Doctrinal Commission and the Commission for the Oriental Churches. Revision was requested and the expectation was a new and truly ecumenical text on Catholic principles for ecumenism. This became possible only because Pope John had decided to elevate the Secretariat for Christian Unity to the rank of a conciliar commission. As a consequence, this new organ was empowered to prepare and to present texts for the council.

3.2. *Shaping a Conciliar Identity*

The first council period lasted until December 8, 1962. In the last week of this first period—from December 1 to 6, a text of fundamental importance was laid out before the council fathers: the "Schema on the Church." This *De ecclesia*-project had been prepared by the Theological Commission, largely under the influence of its secretary, Sebastiaan Tromp, who

[46] Vatican II, 'Dei verbum (November 18, 1965),' *AAS* 58 (1966), 817–36.

had been the ghostwriter for the 1943 encyclical *Mystici corporis*.[47] When looking back at the evolutions since Pius IX and Vatican I's constitution *Pastor aeternus*, one is reminded of the importance of this theme. At Vatican I the initial and broad schema on the church was eventually replaced by a draft focusing only on the role of the Roman Pontiff. In addition, the "Schema on Priestly Life" and the "Schema on the Bishops," prepared under Pius IX, were never promulgated. The adjournment of Vatican I in 1870 resulted in ecclesiological blindspots, where all attention was focused on the role of the Bishop of Rome, while attention to the broader ecclesiological issues faded out. As already illustrated, Vatican I's top-bottom-ecclesiology was successively implemented in several encyclicals as well as in the 1917 Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law.[48] Only now, almost a century later, was the role and structure of the church addressed once again, and any observer can easily understand why the ecclesiological debate of Vatican II would rank among the central debates of the council. Already in the liturgy debate, an implicit ecclesiological perspective had been portrayed, by focusing more on the role of the episcopal conferences. Now the church's identity as a community was put on the table.

When the "Schema on the Church" was presented to the council fathers, it soon became clear that the draft prepared by the Theological Commission largely reflected Vatican I's teachings. Once the schema had been distributed for discussion among the fathers (only during the first period) and had been put on the agenda, overruling Cardinal Ottaviani's request to deal with a "Schema on the Blessed Virgin Mary" first, a group of influential theologians, including people like Karl Rahner, Edward Schillebeeckx, Gerard Philips, and Joseph Ratzinger, started preparing their critical reactions to the official *De ecclesia*.[49] These theologians began drafting replacement schemata and worked towards a removal of the official text from the conciliar agenda. Therefore, they distributed their own proposals to the bishops, on a large scale, in order to influence the debate and to counter the ecclesiology proposed in the official schema. These replacement texts featured an "ecclesiology from below" stressing the church as a mystery and highlighting its sacramental nature, whereas the official document

47 Pius XII, 'Mystici corporis (June 29, 1943),' *AAS* 35 (1943), 193–248.

48 *Codex iuris canonici Pii X Pontificis iussu digestus, Benedicti Papae XV auctoritate promulgatus*, ed. Pietro Gasparri (Rome, 1917).

49 On these reactions, and in particular the role played by German theologians, see Günther Wassilowsky, *Universales Heilssakrament Kirche: Karl Rahners Beitrag zur Ekklesiologie des II. Vatikanums* [Innsbrucker theologische Studien 59] (Innsbruck, 2001).

ran along the lines of the ecclesiological principles put forward by the nineteenth-century "Roman School;" and it emphasized the church's central and hierarchical organization, stressing what is called the "visible" or juridical-structural element of the church. The critiques prepared by theologians, such as Congar and Rahner, were soon voiced by the council fathers themselves, leading to another polarized debate.

After Cardinal Ottaviani had introduced the text, already forecasting the attacks on the schema, members from the SPCU like the Belgian Bishop De Smedt vehemently attacked the "Schema on the Church," on December 1, 1962, calling it a display of "clericalism, juridicism, and triumphalism." The Belgian Cardinal Leo-Joseph Suenens pointed out that the position of the church was the central issue to be discussed by Vatican II and offered to structure all council materials around the double axis of what he called *ecclesia ad intra* (the church's internal organization and structure) and *ecclesia ad extra* (the church in its relationship to the outside world). The amount of time to adequately deal with this schema was much too short; and, after six days of discussion, the debate was interrupted, to be picked up again during the second conciliar period.

Before entering into more detail about the later conciliar evolutions, we wish to return to two items: first, the role of John XXIII and how he related to the conciliar assembly; and second, the importance of the theologians at Vatican II.

From the commission vote onward it had become clear that the pope had embraced as a principle for the council: *Concilium episcoporum est*: the Council belongs to the bishops. The pope put great trust in the activity of the Holy Spirit and in the working of the world episcopate as such. This in itself clearly reflected how the church would have to work according to John XXIII. He refused to put himself and his office in the center, apart from those moments when he felt called to safeguard Catholic unity. This in itself created awareness on the side of the bishops that they, as the world episcopate, had a highly significant role to play. That awareness had a major ecclesiological impact. Nevertheless, the sense of subsidiarity followed by John XXIII also created practical problems. The council agenda contained some seventy preparatory schemata, of which only a few had been debated in the first conciliar period. A better organizational structure was needed; and, already on December 7, 1962, the new structure of a Coordinating Commission was set up. It was responsible for following up on conciliar activities between the two council periods, the so-called "intersession." This structure would remain active throughout the council's duration.

Having already mentioned the names of some important theologian protagonists, it is important to explain the role of conciliar theologians, before proceeding to our survey of conciliar events under Pope Paul VI. When sketching the postponement of the October 13 commission elections, we had already indicated that the role of the bishops at this council was an extraordinary one. This was reinforced to a certain extent by the abovementioned attitude of the pope and his trust in the mechanisms of subsidiarity. Certainly after Vatican II's revelation debate the conciliar atmosphere itself played an enormous role. The presence of the world episcopate, of hundreds of theological experts, of diplomats,[50] and journalists all in one single city led to a massive and unique exchange of ideas, opinions, and even new and lasting friendships between local bishops who, before the council, hardly had time to keep such contacts. Moreover, this atmosphere created a perfect breeding ground for the spreading of new theological insights. In particular the opening speech of John XXIII had given way to the insertion of theological currents that sought to integrate modern thought, and theologians such as Karl Rahner and Edward Schillebeeckx would insist strongly on the need to rephrase classic theological formulae.[51] On an almost daily basis, theologians such as Hans Küng, Yves Congar, Henri de Lubac, Lucien Cerfaux, and Joseph Ratzinger were actively delivering speeches and conferences treating the topics debated at the council.[52] As we have mentioned before, this had as a consequence that many a bishop received a "second theological training" and was updated by these conferences. On many occasions bishops allowed their theologians to write their council interventions, thereby offering them a direct impact on the council's decision making. Also, many theologians were granted the official status of *peritus* (council expert) and could assist at the general congregations as well as be active as a conciliar commission consultor. All of this created a dynamics that was hardly thinkable in the period before the council.

When on December 8, 1962, the first period was solemnly closed, it would be the last conciliar act carried out by Pope John XXIII. Already during the council, the news had spread that the pope was seriously ill.

---

[50] On the diplomatic and political aspect of the council, see Alberto Melloni, *L'Altra Roma: Politica e S. Sede durante il Concilio Vaticano II, 1959–1965* (Bologna, 2000).

[51] See Karl Rahner, 'Was ist eine dogmatische Aussage?,' *Schriften zur Theologie* 5 (1962), 54–81.

[52] Cf. Jared Wicks, 'Theologians at Vatican Council,' appendix five in Wicks's book *Doing Theology*, pp. 187–233.

While the conciliar commissions carried on their activities and theological struggles in the spring and summer of 1963, Pope John XXIII was fighting his own struggle with death.

On June 3, 1963 Pope John XXIII passed from this life. His death brought grief and condolences from all over the world, in Catholic, non-Catholic, and even atheist milieus. The impact of this pope would be felt long after his death.

4. *The Council under Paul VI*

With the memory of Vatican I's untimely adjournment in mind, the death of John XXIII raised the big question: Will the council be continued? Within the college of cardinals, tensions lived between those who thought it best to end the entire affair and return to daily work, for both theological and practical reasons. Obviously the council had had serious effects on the daily governance of the world church, both on the level of the Roman Curia and on the level of local dioceses. Others stressed that the path taken could not now be interrupted, among them Cardinal Giovanni Battista Montini. To the disappointment of Cardinal Giuseppe Siri, famously (or notoriously) known as "the pope that was never elected,"[53] on June 21, 1963, the conclave elected Montini, the Archbishop of Milan. He had been created a cardinal only in 1958. Montini took the name of Paul VI. The new pope had already shown himself to be a moderately open voice during the council's first period. He would soon prove to be an altogether different personality than John XXIII.[54]

Almost immediately upon his election—in a radio-message on June 29 of that year—Pope Paul made it clear that the council was to be reconvened in the fall of 1963 and that he would continue along the lines set out by his predecessor. Paul VI would become the pope under whose rule all of the sixteen conciliar documents received their final approval, and promulgation. He would lead Vatican II through its next three periods

[53] See Benny Lai, *Il Papa non eletto: Giuseppe Siri, Cardinale di Santa Romana Chiesa* (Rome, 1993).

[54] On Pope Paul VI, a multitude of studies has appeared. For a bibliographical survey, see the lemma on this pope, Karim Schelkens and Jürgen Mettepenningen, *Paul VI*, in *Personenlexikon zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*, ed. Michael Quisinsky and Peter Walter (Freiburg, 2012), pp. 207–10. On Cardinal Montini during the first council period, see two articles by Franco Giulio Brambilla, 'Il card. Montini e l'inizio del Concilio Vaticano II: Una ricostruzione storico-teologica,' Parts 1 and 2, *Rivista del Clero Italiano* 83 (2002), 504–19; and pp. 600–14.

and two more intersessions; and, therefore, his impact on Vatican II is not to be underestimated. Already before the opening of the second period, Paul VI initiated some important measures, turning the first intersession of Vatican II into a so-called "second preparation." For instance, council regulations were adapted in order to shorten discussions and to avoid endless repetitions of arguments during the series of council interventions. Bishops with common viewpoints could express their opinions via one conciliar spokesperson; and a less important structure such as the *Secretariatus de negotiis extra ordinem*, was abolished. Also, as of September 12, 1963 a new structure was established, called the Board of Council Moderators. This board would be an intermediary organ between the pope and the council, thereby creating a second organism, next to the council presidency, responsible for the everyday practical organization, the organizing of voting rounds, etc. The moderators were Cardinals Julius Döpfner of Munich, Giacomo Lercaro of Bologna, Leo-Joseph Suenens of Mechelen, and the Armenian patriarch Grégoire-Pierre Agagianian. The four council moderators would come to play a major role on occasions when the council had to make difficult decisions, as with the initiative, in the end of October 1963, to propose five questions to the conciliar assembly, in order to decide upon the orientation to be taken in the difficult discussion on episcopal collegiality. While in the latter issue, Cardinal Suenens played a pivotal role, his colleague moderator Cardinal Döpfner took the lead role in the council's reorganization, presenting his own "Plan for the Council," which would ultimately lead to the downsizing of the huge number of about seventy schemata still to be addressed.[55]

Finally, on September 29, 1963 the second council period was officially inaugurated. In his much awaited opening address, Paul VI clarified once more that he would continue the policies and the agenda of a Catholic *aggiornamento* as set out by John XXIII. The church, the pope claimed, is committed to dialogue with the modern world and to reposition itself both in its outward relationships and internally. With all of this, it became clear that the focal point of Vatican II would remain an ecclesiological one.

[55] Already in January of 1963, the Coordinating Commission of the Council had decided to downsize the amount of schemata to the number of seventeen remaining documents (see *AS* V, 1, p. 201). Döpfner took the initiative of reorganizing the conciliar agenda further with his "Plan." See Klaus Wittstadt, 'Vorschläge von Julius Kardinal Döpfner an Papst Paul VI: Zur Fortführung der Konzilsarbeiten (Juli 1963),' in *Fe i teologia en la historia*, ed. Joan Busquets and Maria Martinell [Scripta et documenta 59], (Barcelona, 1997), pp. 565–84.

In what follows, we will not discuss the conciliar events chronologically, following them period per period. Rather, we opt for presenting the most important debates in a thematic order, following the broad agenda structure as indicated: the church's view of itself, and the Catholic Church in its relationship to the outside world and modern culture.

4.1. *Rediscovering the Church as Sacrament*

The central debate of the council, taking place during the second and third periods of the council, led by Pope Paul VI, would turn out to be the debate on the nature of the church, and the role of the episcopate. This debate would lead to the promulgation of *Lumen gentium* in November 1964, and featured a variety of themes. The need for a broad discussion on the nature of the church had been lingering on since Vatican I, where the non-treated schemas had vanished into the archives, leaving many theologians longing for an ecclesiological adjustment of the accent on the Roman Pontiff as laid out by Vatican I.[56] In that sense, John XXIII's council is immediately linked to the council of Pius IX, and the interpretation and reception of Vatican I's definitions offered in *Pastor aeternus* were again under discussion.[57]

As stated above, the end of the first period was closed with a short debate on the church attacking the presentation of the church as *societas perfecta*. This model had entered theological discourse mainly since the eighteenth century in order to stress the church's independence over against modern states. Combined with the notion of the church as Mystical Body it had entered the preparatory "Schema on the Church," now increasingly under siege.[58] In the intersession, some important events occurred within the new Doctrinal Commission. Upon a suggestion made by Cardinal Suenens, the Louvain theologian and Belgian senator Gerard Philips—the joint secretary to the Doctrinal Commission and one of the principal co-drafters of the preparatory "Schema on the Church"—had collaborated

---

[56] Cf. Adam Kubis, 'La primauté du pape à la lumière des I et II Conciles du Vatican,' *Analecta Cracoviensia* 4 (1972), 191–215.

[57] Peter Hünermann, 'Theologischer Kommentar zu Lumen gentium,' in *Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Zweiten Vatikanische Konzil*, ed. Peter Hünermann and Bernd Jochen Hilberath (Freiburg, 2004), 2:263–582. See Walter Kasper, 'Das Petrusamt als Dienst der Einheit: Die Lehre des I und II Vatikanischen Konzils und die gegenwärtige Diskussion,' in *Das Papstamt: Dienst oder Hindernis für die ökumene?*, ed. Vasilios von Aristi and Heinrich Fries (Regensburg, 1985), pp. 113–38.

[58] Georges Dejaifve, *Un tournant décisif de l'ecclésiologie à Vatican II* [Le point théologique 31] (Paris, 1978).

with Karl Rahner and Yves Congar in preparing a new "Schema on the Church," with an altogether different structure, but respecting the legacy of the preconciliar Theological Commission's debates.[59] After an internal procedural vote and some revisions, the Doctrinal Commission decided to accept the "Philips Schema," and to put aside the former and official text. The implications would soon be felt when, during the second period in the fall of 1963, the council fathers received a new version of the "Schema on the Church." At that juncture, the document featured an ecclesiology of the "People-of-God as a pilgrimage people," and, above all, the new draft focused on a "baptismal ecclesiology," defended already before the council by protagonists such as Cardinal Bea. All of this calls for a little more explanation.

For a start, the "baptismal" element turned out to be a central point. The focus on the sacrament of baptism implied a re-defining of the church from another perspective. Moving away from the hierarchical pyramid model so predominant since the late nineteenth century, the ecclesiological focus was no longer the head of the church, rather the people at its base. Now of crucial importance was the acknowledgment that the church consists of all the baptized members. This reversed the structural horizon proposed by the former schema, and now focused on the people as a communion of believers. The notion of *communion*, therefore, would become a basic ecclesiological category at Vatican II, yet always closely tied to a series of other biblical images.[60] Within that context, the role of the sacramentally ordained ministers would also be reconsidered, drawing renewed attention to the orders of diaconate, of priesthood, and of the bishop. We will return to the latter point further on. Suffice it to say here, that the thinking on the church was done from below, in an ecclesiological re-reading of the Catholic Church that might perhaps be presented as a series of concentric circles, in which the different circles are distinguished not primarily on a juridical, but rather on a sacramental basis.

[59] See Philips's own commentary on *Lumen gentium*, which remains one of the best available, Gerard Philips, *L'église et son mystère au deuxième concile du Vatican. Histoire, texte et commentaire de la Constitution Lumen gentium*, 2 Vols. (Paris, 1967–8).

[60] For a study on the origins and development of the communio-ecclesiology, see Dennis M. Doyle, *Communion Ecclesiology: Vision and Versions* (Maryknoll, 2000).

The core of the matter lies in the renewed discovery of the church's sacramental nature.[61] In such a model, the outer and broadest circle, constituting the church as a whole, consists of all of the baptized faithful. All belong to the communion by virtue of the sacrament of baptism, which reveals the ecclesiological renewal of Vatican II. For a start, the laity regained their own and fundamental role in the ecclesial reality; and would no longer be regarded as the "lowest" category in a monarchic feudal organizational structure. They constitute, rather, the "People of God," and share in the church's mission. This biblical notion, tied to the sacramental nature of the church, was proposed as an holistic and integrative category, encompassing the entire people, making it clear why, within this overall context, the council (*Lumen gentium* 12) spoke of the *sensus fidelium* as "the whole peoples's supernatural discernment in matters of faith," in conjunction to the admission that the entire people shares in the single and universal priesthood of Christ.

Next, then, distinctions were made *within* this community of baptized, carefully distinguishing between the ordained and the laity, on the basis of the church's sacramental nature. Returning to the concept of concentric cirlces, the ordained ministry constitutes a series of inner circles, following the three degrees of the sacrament of order: the largest circle comprises the lowest degree of the sacrament of order: the deacons. As a consequence, the restoration of the diaconate in its own right and as a separate and permanent state of ordained ministry—accessible to married men—would be among the immediate and most tangible effects of this sacramental focus in ecclesiology.[62] With Vatican II, the permanent diaconate had "reappeared" in the ecclesiological structure; and it no longer merely existed in the church as a transitional stage on the road towards

[61] See the study of Leo Declerck, 'Les réactions de quelques "periti" du Concile Vatican II à la Nota explicativa praevia (G. Philips, J, Ratzinger. H. de Lubac, H. Schauf),' *Notiziario Istituto Paolo VI* 61 (2011), 47–69, there 49.

[62] The notion of sacramentality as foundational for Vatican II's vision of the church also runs through the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, see Pierre de Cointet, 'La sacramentalité de l'église, un fondement de son rapport au monde (Gaudium et Spes 40–5), in *Vatican II: La sacramentalité de l'église et le Royaume*, ed. Étienne Michelin and Antoine Guggenheim [Centre Notre-Dame de Vie: Série théologie 13] (Paris, 2008), pp. 83–96. Also see Walter Kasper, 'Die Kirche als universales Sakrament des Heils,' in *Glaube im Prozess: Christsein nach dem II. Vatikanum*, ed. Elmar Klinger and Klaus Wittstadt (Freiburg, 1984), 221–39.

priestly ordination,[63] the second degree of the sacrament of order. Ultimately then, an important stress was laid on the highest degree: episcopal ordination, as the fullness of the sacrament of order, thus tying the lower degrees to the bishops's ordination.

All of this would ultimately become visible in the very structure and order of the chapters of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen gentium*.[64] Very deliberately the council would opt for placing the chapters on the mystery of the church, and on the people of God, *before* the chapter on the Catholic hierarchy, accentuating the constitutive role of its baptismal ecclesiology. We have only touched upon the role of the bishops briefly, but this, of course, does not mean that no discussion was raised on the nature of the Catholic hierarchy. On the contrary, the hierarchy came to the center of attention throughout the second and third periods of the council, in the debate on episcopal collegiality. The debate behind chapter three of *Lumen gentium* dealt entirely with the Catholic hierarchy, with questions addressing the exercise of power in the church, and, more in particularly, the role of the bishops in their relationship to the Roman Pontiff.[65] While Vatican I had defined papal primacy in strong terms, an awareness of some ecclesiological blindspots had grown over the decades. The realization that the united body of bishops has an important role to play in the governing of both the local and the universal church now came to the surface, as, inspired by the *ressourcement* movements and their return to patristic and biblical sources, the relationship between the episcopate and the Bishop of Rome would be addressed by analogy to the relationship between Peter and the Apostles.

Vatican I's *Pastor aeternus* and its reception in church practice had led to the general impression that the Roman Pontiff stood apart from, above, and thus to an extent outside of the group of bishops. Vatican II now proposed, on biblical and patristic grounds, that the universal body of bishops should be regarded as a "college of bishops." Contemporary and biblically based ecclesiology had proposed that the "episcopal college" was in fact succeeding the "college of Apostles." Within that "college" the role of Peter

[63] On the permanent diaconate, see Francis Deniau, 'Le diaconat à la lumière des trois fonctions du Christ et de l'église, selon Vatican II,' in *Diaconat au XXI siècle* [Labor et fides] (Brussels, Ottawa, and Geneva, 1997), pp. 103–15.

[64] Vatican II, 'Lumen gentium (November 21, 1964),' *AAS* 57 (1965), 5–71.

[65] Cf. Istituto Paolo VI, *Paolo VI e la collegialità episcopale* [Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Paolo VI 15] (Brescia, 1995).

was now being re-debated. Perhaps the best way to explain this is by using the biblically inspired words of Cardinal Bernard Jan Alfrink, who claimed that a shift was to be made from an ecclesiology that spoke of "Peter *and* the Apostles," distinguishing between the Peter and the college as two entities and stressing their separate role and function, towards an inclusive model of ecclesiology stressing the relationship between "Peter and the *other* Apostles."[66] Alfrink's exact phrasing entered into *Lumen gentium*'s article 22, where it states that "Just as by the Lord's will, Saint Peter and the *other* apostles constituted one apostolic college, so in a similar way the Roman Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, and the bishops, as the successors of the apostles, are joined together."

Starting from the juridical *societas-perfecta*-model where the pope is put above the college of bishops, ecclesiology's shift towards "collegiality" had serious implications. While previously the pope's sacramental act of consecrating bishops was secondary to the primordially juridical act of appointing them, the core of the doctrine of collegiality was to tie the notions of "collegiality" and "sacramentality" together. Once again, the effects of a sacramental foundation of ecclesiology were felt, much to the discomfort of council fathers clinging to earlier framed canonical principles. The existence of the college is based primarily on the *sacrament* of episcopal ordination. As collegiality and sacramentality went hand in hand, the sacrament of episcopal ordination became the basis for the exercise of the threefold office in the church. In sum: collegial thinking included the recognition that, by virtue of his consecration (*vi consecrationis*), a bishop gains full membership in the college and participates in the exercise of the universal and threefold office in the church: i.e. the functions of Priest (sanctification), King (government), and Prophet (teaching). This would affirm a strong sacramental link between the Petrine office and that of the bishops.[67]

The sacramental revalorization of the role of the bishops in the church had a tremendous impact. For a start, Vatican II's move away from a canonically grounded view of ecclesiology, shed new light on the 1870 definition of papal infallibility. Among members of the council minority, this stirred up fears that acceptance of the doctrine of episcopal collegiality

---

[66] See the ninth chapter—entitled "Petrus en de andere apostelen"—of Alfrink's biography, Ton H.M. van Schaik, *Alfrink: Een biografie* (Amsterdam, 1997), pp. 279–367.

[67] On this complex theological issue, see the article by Leo Kenis, 'Diaries: Private Sources for a Study of the Second Vatican Council,' in *The Belgian Contribution to the Second Vatican Council*, pp. 29–53, there 44–50.

would ultimately lead to decreased papal power and the loss of papal prerogatives. Therefore, some fractions strongly opposed the "doctrine of episcopal collegiality"; and in some circles the old fears of febronianism or even conciliarism—claiming that the authority of the pope should be subjected to the higher authority of a council[68]—rose again. The question therefore was how, in this sacramental structuring, the role of Peter should be defined. Within the conciliar minority, already during the second period, strong hopes were fostered that Pope Paul would intervene in this debate, and call an end to the direction the council was now taking. Precisely at this juncture, one of the most painful moments of Vatican II took place, in the fall of 1964, when several theologians, among them Carlo Colombo, Wilhelm Bertrams, and Gerard Philips, were involved in preparing a statement commissioned by Paul VI.[69]

4.2. *The Nota Explicativa Praevia*

The pope's statement cannot be neglected when dealing with Vatican II.[70] This concise, yet theologically very dense text would fundamentally agree with the doctrines expressed in the draft on the church, but sought to redirect the interpretation of collegiality, as it further explained some of its elements, in order to respond to the anxieties existing within the minority. All the while, Paul VI did not heed all of the requests of council minority members, as they had been proposed in a *Nota personalmente riservata* regarding chapter three of the "Schema on the Church," on the the eve of the third council period. The *Nota riservata* was drafted by Cardinal Arcadio Marria Larraona, then prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and signed by 25 cardinals and a list bishops—among them Monsignor Lefebvre. Following the controversy raised against the doctrine of collegiality in the Thomist periodical *Divinitas*, these council fathers demanded that the pope act authoritatively to the extent of deleting the entire chapter from the document.

Paul VI was by no means ready to accept either the note or its argumentation—stressing that the "new" doctrine implied a rejection of the Church's teachings on divine right—, and instead of blocking the

---

[68] Cf. Massimo Faggioli, 'La recezione della collegialità del Vaticano II: Le riviste teologiche 'Romane,' 1963–1970,' in *Réceptions de Vatican II: Le concile au risque de l'histoire et des espaces humaines*, ed. Gilles Routhier [IT 28] (Louvain, 2004), pp. 19–48.

[69] *Paolo VI e i problemi ecclesiologici al Concilio* [Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Paolo VI 7] (Rome, 1989).

[70] Declerck, 'Les réactions de quelques "periti",' there 49–51.

doctrine of collegiality altogether, the pope decided to add a clarifying note to chapter three. The document considered here was the so-called *Nota explicativa praevia*, a document of great importance, yet also of great complexity. It stated that the notion of "college" was *not*, as it once was in Roman Law, to be understood in terms of a group of equals; and it further underlined the fact that the college cannot exist *without* the pope and cannot act without the pope's (*a posteriori*) consent. The note sought to clarify the central and unifying role of the pope and stressed that the doctrine of episcopal collegiality did not in any sense imply a limitation of papal prerogatives, clarifying that "certain acts" of church government can only be taken by the pope alone, and not by the bishops. The *Nota explicativa praevia* was distributed to the fathers in the week of November 14, 1964, along with the *Expensio modorum* (an overview explaining the changes made to the "Schema on the Church").[71]

Since neither the members of the Doctrinal Commission adapting the schema, nor the fathers had been warned ahead of time about the insertion of this document—annexed as an explanatory note with chapter three on the Catholic hierarchy, yet not as a part of the schema, and thus it would never be voted upon—this action from above caused an enormous shock wave, raising serious protest. Soon the week in which this happened was dubbed as the "Black Week" of Vatican II. Many bishops felt that the trust placed in the bishops by John XXIII had been seriously damaged by such an authoritarian act from his successor Pope Paul VI. Theologians such as Congar, de Lubac, and Ratzinger were highly critical of what they judged to be the pope's uncollegial behavior.[72] Others, including some lobbying groups[73] of the council minority such as the *Coetus internationalis patrum*, led by Monsignor Lefebvre,[74] saw this as a moral victory. This group of

---

[71] The explanatory note was critically edited and accompanied by a rich dossier regarding its redactional itinerary by Jan Grootaers, *Primauté et collégialité: Le dossier de Gérard Philips sur la Nota Explicativa Praevia, Lumen Gentium, Chapître III* [BETL 72] (Louvain, 1986). The reconstruction of the events of the Black Week has been published by Cardinal Luis Antonio Tagle, 'The Black Week of Vatican II: November 14–21, 1964,' in *History of Vatican II*, 3:388–452.

[72] See Leo Declerck, 'Les réactions de quelques "periti",' 47–69.

[73] It should be said here that the council featured a multitude of lobby groups, each trying to impose their own agenda on the council. Among them also the group around Cardinal Lercaro, dom Helder Camara and Bishop Himmer, "The church and the poor." See Giuseppe Alberigo, 'Die Kirche der Armen: Van Johannes XXIII. Zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil,' in *Blutende Hoffnung: Gustavo Gutiérrez*, ed. Mariano Delgado (Luzern, 2000), pp. 67–88.

[74] Philippe J. Roy, *Le Coetus Internationalis Patrum: Un groupe d'opposants au sein du Concile Vatican II* [unpublished dissertation], 8 Vols. (Québec, 2011).

bishops reflected the more intransigent side of the council and consisted of a large number of bishops from countries such as Spain, France, Italy, Brazil, and other Latin American countries.

Ultimately, the renewed ecclesial perspective of Vatican II gained ground and the doctrine of collegiality remained prominently present within the council's teaching. While the pope's role as the visible sign and center of Catholic unity was undiminished, the Roman Pontiff was, in a way, re-incorporated in the church *within* the entire college of bishops; and ecumenically, although not identifiable with it, this shift towards a collegial understanding of the papacy related more easily to a view of papal primacy in terms of a *primus inter pares* as held in Anglican and Orthodox churches. It can be clearly seen as a further development and another horizon for dealing with what was expressed in *Pastor aeternus*, without doctrinally overruling Vatican I's understanding of papal infallibility. On top of this, the sacramental re-structuring would have its own special impact. For one, the notion was solidly established that the church's universal government would henceforth be carried out with a more important role for the bishops, which would lead to the establishment of a permanent synodal structure. In that light, it is noteworthy to point out that voices critical of a centralist view of the Roman Curia, that periodically echoed strongly in conciliar debates, fostered hopes of a decreasing importance of the curial offices in the governing of the universal Catholic church. To some extent, the focus of Vatican II had shifted away from the central role of the cardinals of the Roman Curia; and here, Gregory Baum's proposed rule of thumb[75] would seem valid, always look to what is *not* said. In this regard it is very interesting to note that, for all the attention to the college of bishops, the college of cardinals, as such, does not play a role in Vatican II ecclesiology, and no single council document even uses the word "cardinal."

Perhaps more important is the fact that the ecclesiological option taken here had its effect on other documents closely tied to the central church debate. For instance, the practical implications of the doctrine of episcopal collegiality can be well sensed in the "Schema on the Bishops." This was put on hold for a while until the votes had been completed on the collegiality doctrine; and it developed the role and importance of the bishops

---

[75] Gregory Baum, 'Vatican II's Constitution on Revelation: History and Interpretation,' *TS* 28 (1967), 51–75, there 51: Normally an argument from silence is not worth much. However, if one learns that the silence on an important point came about through the deletion of a significant passage, then the silence acquires a real message.

on a more practical level. The baptismal ecclesiology and the notion of the *sensus fidelium* on the other hand, were strongly felt in the discussion of the "Schema on the Lay Apostolate," where the fact that the church was seen as the people of God led to an increased importance and awareness of the role of the laity within the church. All of this was reflected in the council hall, too. While Pope John XXIII had already allowed the presence of a lay person in the Council hall, Jean Guitton, Paul VI took the effort further. As of the second period the pope had thirteen "lay auditors" invited to assist the conciliar congregations, many of them having been prominent members of the pre-conciliar Catholic Action Movement, such as Vittorino Veronese. These two men: Guitton and Veronese would be among the first lay persons to address an ecumenical council in centuries. Moreover, from the beginning of the third council period onward, a group of female lay auditrices was also allowed to enter the basilica, creating an historical moment in the history of the councils. Many of these lay persons contributed to the redaction of documents such as *Apostolicam actuositatem* and *Gaudium et spes*, and thus helped shape Vatican II's stress on the importance of dialogue with the modern world.[76]

4.3. *The Church in the Modern World*

The relationship of the Catholic Church to the outside world, what Cardinal Suenens called *ad extra*, was a strong point throughout the Vatican II debates. This had become evident already in October 1962, when the council issued a "Message to the World,"[77] and was even more pronounced in the draft devoted to modern means of communication. But, it became much more important in the drafting of a new schema, which was not prepared by the preparatory commissions but arose out of the council's very own concerns. This text dealt with the relationship of the church to the modern world; and it would ultimately become the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et spes*.[78] The so-called "Schema XIII"—it initially lacked a name because

[76] Philippe Delhaye, *Le dialogue de l'église et du monde d'après Gaudium et spes* (Paris, 1967).

[77] The *Nuntius ad universos homines mittendus* had been in preparation for a while, and was influenced by theologians such as Chenu. It was read out by Vatican II's general secretary, Monsignor Pericles Felici, during the general congregation of October 20, 1962. See *AS* I/1, pp. 230–2.

[78] Vatican II, 'Gaudium et spes (December 7, 1965),' *AAS* 58 (1966), 1024–120. For background on the constitution, see Giovanni Turbanti, *Un concilio per il mondo moderno: La redazione della costituzione pastorale Gaudium et spes del Vaticano II* (Bologna, 2000).

of its novelty—constituted something unique in the history of councils. It treated the church's attitude about modern developments and culture; and it tackled topics such as war and peace, the relationship with atheism, problems concerning marriage and family life, and, connected to the latter, birth control. The entire schema put the dignity of the human person at the central core of attention.

In its choice of language and style, *Gaudium et spes* is one of the conciliar documents that very closely resonated with the opinions that had been expressed by proponents of the *nouvelle théologie* movement. It is in this text that the council fathers "acknowledged that the Christian message should be formulated anew in a new age and amid new circumstances. This was necessary in order to convey the fundamental essence of faith to the modern world."[79] But here too, the debate did not go on without difficulties. The ends of marriage were vehemently discussed, with some bishops claiming that married Catholic couples had no right to decide for themselves about the number of children they would have, etc. As demonstrated in the studies of Jan Grootaers, the question of birth control led to serious opposition; and, as a result, Paul VI intervened again.[80] He removed it from the conciliar agenda and reserved the matter for a Pontifical Commission on Birth Control. This would ultimately lead to the 1968 encyclical *Humanae vitae*, which gave rise to strong international protest.[81]

Dialogue with the outside world was developed in other conciliar documents as well. Already in *Lumen gentium*, promulgated in the third period of the council, the Catholic Church's commitment to ecumenism had been touched upon. But, it would be a new draft, coming from the SPCU, which really opened up this possibility once and for all. The pre-conciliar draft on christian unity had been attacked for dealing only with the Uniate churches. Hence, a new text was composed, which would constitute an important basis for several Vatican II documents.

Members of the SPCU, of the Commission for the Oriental Churches, and of the Doctrinal Commission had drafted a new "Schema on Christian Unity," consisting of chapters presenting Catholic principles for ecumenical dialogue and two sections dealing with the Catholic Church's relationship with the Orthodox Churches and the Reformed denominations. This

---

79 Van Geest, *The Incomprehensibility of God*, p. 185.

80 Jan Grootaers and Jan Jans, *La régulation des naissances à Vatican II: Une semaine de crise* [ANL 43] (Louvain, 2002).

81 Paul VI, 'Humanae vitae (July 25, 1968),' *AAS* 60 (1968), 481–503.

new draft, presented in the second period, initially contained these chapters, but also chapters on the relationship of the Catholic Church to the Jews, and on religious liberty. Ultimately, these last chapters would be split of into separate schemata, paving the way for the documents *Nostra aetate* (gradually dealing not merely with the Jews, but also with other non-Christian religions) and *Dignitatis humanae*.[82]

The topic of the church's relationship to non-Christian religions was among the most difficult topics treated by the council. One of the fundamental questions raised was the church's relationship to the Jews, and the historical background of Christian anti-Semitism. Members of the SPCU had proposed to offer a clear and unambiguous position of the church distancing itself from anti-Semitism. This, and in particular the question as to whether the council should openly distance itself from the doctrine accusing the jewish people of deicide, met with strong opposition from Arab Christians and several oriental patriarchs, such as the Melkite Greek Catholic Patriarch of Antioch, Maximos IV Saigh. These voices feared persecution and attacks from muslim populations on their people in the Middle East.[83] Time and again, proposals were made to scratch this project from the conciliar agenda; despite strong efforts to remove the Schema, Pope Paul VI insisted on its being discussed, and on November 20, 1964, the council voted in favor of the document. Yet, the council fathers were receiving anonymous pamphlets, as well as some leaflets authored by the French journalist, Léon de Poncins, circulating warnings about a Judeo-Masonic complot, accusing Cardinal Bea of being a Jew-in-disguise. Even after the holocaust, some were holding such positions.[84] In order to come to meet the sensitivities of the Eastern patriarchs, some important decisions were made in the redaction of the document: it was decided to leave out the word "deicidium," to insert a phrase explaining that the declaration was not intending to interfere in political issues, but was inspired solely by religious charity. This would mark the postconciliar relationships between Rome and the other religions for decades, under the leadership of Johannes Willebrands. In 1965, before the inauguration of the last council period, the latter would travel to the Middle-East together with bishop

[82] Vatican II, 'Nostra aetate (October 28, 1965),' *AAS* 58 (1966), 740–44; 'Dignitatis humanae (December 7, 1965),' *AAS* (1966), 929–46.

[83] Piero Doria, 'La dichiarazione conciliaire sugli ebrei e le reazioni dei paesi arabi,' *Notes et documents: Institut International Jacques Maritain* 35/22–3 (2012), 84–94.

[84] See Nicla Buonasorte, 'Iudaei Deo adhuc carissimi? La pubblicistica anti-semitica al concilio Vaticano II,' *Humanitas* 57 (2002), 481–93; Philippe Chenaux, 'De la Shoah à Vatican II: Le succès des pionniers,' *Histoire du christianisme magazine* 16 (2003), 66–71.

De Smedt, in order to convince the patriarchs of the value of the conciliar declaration.

Finally, with *Nostra aetate*, the Roman Catholic Church underlined, after a long tradition of negative rhetoric, its strong and historical ties with the Jewish people—much in line with Pius XI, who had already made the statement that, spiritually, all Christians are Semites—and valorized the positive efforts made by members of other religions in their search for the truth. The council's declaration on non-christian religions presented another unique feature: although refraining to adopt the literary genre of the conciliar canons, it presented the one single reprobation expressed in the corpus of sixteen documents, where the document's final article asserts that "the Church reproves, as foreign to the mind of Christ, any discrimination against men or harassment of them because of their race, color, condition of life, or religion." Once again, the individual's duty and right to pursue the truth was strongly reaffirmed. This was very much in line with *Gaudium et spes*, where the individual was granted the right to err in his or her search for the truth, which led to the acknowledgement that dialogue should even be possible with non-believers. Statements such as these do indeed underline the difference in style and discourse between Vatican II teaching and such earlier church documents as the *Syllabus of errors* issued by Pius IX, or *Pascendi dominici gregis* and *Lamentabili sane exitu* under Pius X. With the Second Vatican Council, the Roman Catholic Church chose to set aside the old condemnatory language and rhetoric.

The same is true for that other schema, springing from the "Schema on Christian Unity": the "Schema on Religious Freedom." In a meeting between Cardinal Bea and WCC-leader Visser 't Hooft, at Gazzada, years before the council, it had become clear that religious freedom would be a part of the council's agenda of dialogue with the world. Here too, the process of drafting the document received strong support from Paul VI, who insisted on promulgating the declaration. Up until the pontificate of Pius XII, the official standpoint taken up by the Holy See, on the topic of the relationship between church and state, had been the so-called thesis-hypothesis doctrine. This paradigm was strongly defended by Pius IX when his *Syllabus of errors* had condemned the proposition that a separation between church and state could be legitimate.[85] Now, however, serious

[85] For instance, the Syllabus had condemned proposition n° 55, in which the claim was stated that "the Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church." See Pius IX, 'Syllabus errorum (December 8, 1864),' *ASS* 3 (1867–8), 168–76.

discussion arose over two different approaches to the issue, already dating back to the drafting of preparatory notes prepared within the SPCU as early as 1960. The classic theological standpoint was represented at Vatican II, while at the same instance bishops and theologians, such as the American John Courtney Murray, were quite influential in promoting a more juridical approach to the issue, grounded in the approach offered by the fathers of the U.S. Constitution.[86] This very turn proved in fact that on this subject, the Enlightenment tradition was able to assume a spot within magisterial discourse. Based on the actual situation of a contemporary plurality of churches and religions, combined with the council's strong focus on the dignity of the human person—as stressed in the thinking of Catholic philosophers such as Maritain—the argument gained ground that other religions too should be able to claim the freedom to exercise their religious practices; and a strong stress was laid on the right of the human person to experience his or her religion free from any coercion. Such freedom, the council fathers argued, should no longer be seen as a prerogative only for the Roman Catholic Church. This new view found its way into the Declaration on Religious Freedom *Dignitatis humanae*,[87] in which the council fathers recognized the value of democracy as a basis for the modern state, and acknowledged the separation of church and state. All of the above developments illustrate that the council's "pastoral reflex" was indebted not only to the vision of *Gaudium et spes*; but equally to the three documents for which ultimately, the Secretariat for Christian Unity, set up by John XXIII, was responsible: *Nostra aetate*, *Dignitatis humanae*, and *Unitatis redintegratio*. If anywhere, Vatican II's willingness to enter into conversation with the "other" is reflected there.[88]

This very awareness, and the lasting commitment of the Catholic Church to reach out to the world, and to enter into dialogue with modern man, was perhaps most visible during the solemn closing session of Vatican II.

---

[86] Gerald P. Fogarty, 'Dignitatis Humanae Personae and the American Experience,' in *Vatican II and its Legacy*, ed. Mathijs Lamberigts and Leo Kenis [BETL 166] (Louvain, 2002), pp. 259–87. On Murray, see Silvia Scatena, 'Emiel-Jozef De Smedt, John Courtney Murray and Religious Freedom,' in *The Belgian Contribution to the Second Vatican Council*, ed. Doris Donnelly, Joseph Famerée, Mathijs Lamberigts, and Karim Schelkens (Louvain, 2008), pp. 633–45.

[87] On the redaction history of *Dignitatis humanae*, see Silvia Scatena, *La fatica della libertà: L'elaborazione della dichiarazione "Dignitatis humanae" sulla libertà religiosa del Vaticano II* [TRSR: N.S. 31] (Bologna, 2003).

[88] Cf. Florian Kolfhaus, *Pastorale Lehrverkundigung: Grundmotiv des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils. Untersuchungen zu Unitatis Redintegratio, Dignitatis Humanae, und Nostra Aetate* [Theologia mundi ex urbe: Römische Studien 2] (Berlin, 2010).

On that historic moment, on December 8, 1965, a series of seven messages was read out, directed to a variety of actors in society, such as the politicians and governments, the artists, the young people, women, working people, those who are suffering and ill, and the intellectuals. These statements were read out by bishops or cardinals, but sided by members of the respective categories. On behalf of the intellectuals, Paul VI's close friend Jacques Maritain received the honor.

5. *Renewal and Tradition*:[89] *From Syllabus to Counter-Syllabus*

By the end of the council it had become clear that, as any council, Vatican II constituted an important moment of transition, and of reception, for the Catholic tradition.[90] Again, as any council in the long conciliar history, it had a double bind: it was both an end point, a moment of reception of the past; and at the same time, the documents and decisions proposed by the council had to be received themselves. This formal issue links Vatican II with Vatican I, and all previous councils. By means of illustration, one may be reminded of how Pope Pius IV, immediately following the close of the council of Trent, inaugurated the Congregation of the Council, and charged this new dicastery with the interpretation of the tridentine teachings. Yet, while Pius IV "forbade the publication of any glosses or commentaries on the decrees of the council (…) the conclusion of Vatican II did not entail a prohibition on commenting on the final texts, hence the end of Vatican II did not imply that the Holy See and Roman Curia held a strict monopoly on the interpretation of the council texts."[91]

In fact, any discourse about the reception of Vatican II should therefore always take into account the reception "by" the council as well as the reception "of" the council.[92]

---

[89] The title of this section alludes to the proposal for council hermeneutics offered by Benedict XVI, and picked up by authors such as Matthew L. Lamb and Matthew Levering, who recently edited an elaborate volume entitled *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition* (New York, 2008).

[90] For deepened reflection on this theme, see among others *Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?*, ed. David G. Schultenover (New York, 2008).

[91] Massimo Faggioli, 'A Short History of the Debate on Vatican II,' *Notes et documents: Institut International Jacques Maritain* 35/22–3 (2012), 95–102.

[92] On this, see the inspiring essay by Gilles Routhier, 'Orientamenti per lo studio del Vaticano II come fatto di ricezione,' in *L'evento e le decisioni: Studi sulle dinamiche del concilio Vaticano II*, ed. Maria Teresia Fattori and Alberto Melloni [TRSR: N.S. 20] (Bologna, 1998), pp. 465–500.

The Second Vatican Council was a moment of plural receptions, as it received elements of past magisterial teaching, of Canon Law, of Sacred Scripture, and of previous councils, as well as the insights proposed by the movements of *ressourcement* and renewal present in basic Catholicism and in contemporary theological discourse. All the while it received remnants of the Thomist tradition and scholastic discourse.[93] Still, Vatican II did not attempt simply to maintain continuity with previous papal teaching. In some cases it even contradicted such previous teaching. One thinks for instance how Joseph Ratzinger, seventeen years after the council's closure, indicated how the Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et spes* could be regarded as a "counter-syllabus," a statement which in itself was revealing.[94] Nevertheless, one should refrain from too hastily and unilaterally concluding that Vatican II was in discontinuity with Tradition. While the heritage of Trent, of Vatican I, and of popes such as Pius XII provided touchstones for the debates and outcomes of Vatican II, is it perhaps even more important to appreciate that the council sought continuity with Scripture and with Tradition from the time of the Church Fathers, often finding inspiration in the models of theology and theological discourse present in early Christianity.[95] This in itself makes it abundantly clear that discontinuity and continuity cannot be strictly separated nor conveniently opposed to one another. Clearly, as those at Vatican II discovered, a plurality of continuities and discontinuities can be detected when retracing the evolution of contemporary Catholicism.

---

[93] Joseph A. Komonchak, 'Thomism and the Second Vatican Council,' in *Continuity and Plurality in Catholic Theology*, ed. Anthony J. Cernera (Fairfield, 1998), pp. 53–73.

[94] The citation is found in Joseph Ratzinger, *Theologische Prinzipienlehre: Bausteine zur Fundamentaltheologie* (Munich, 1982), 398: Wenn man nach einer Gesamtdiagnose für den Text [Gaudium et spes] sucht, könnte man sagen, daß er (in Verbindung mit den Texten über Religionsfreiheit und über die Weltreligionen) eine Revision des Syllabus Pius IX., eine Art Gegensyllabus darstellt. […] Begnügen wir uns hier mit der Feststellung, daß der Text die Rolle eines Gegensyllabus spielt und insofern den Versuch einer offiziellen Versöhnung der Kirche mit der seit 1789 gewordenen neuen Zeit darstellt.

[95] In this context, the monograph by Daniele Gianotti, *I Padri della Chiesa al concilio Vaticano II: La teologia patristica nella* Lumen gentium [Biblioteca di teologia dell'evangelizzazione 6] (Bologna, 2010), stresses the importance of patristic discourse for conciliar teaching.

CHAPTER SIX

A DECADE OF CRISIS

1. *Dialogue as Leitmotiv*

Like that of John XXIII, the pontificate of Paul VI was completely dominated by the council. But Paul's was somehow fundamentally different, not in the least because his pontificate had the delicate and complex task of implementing the council.

The entire first decade of implementation of the conciliar decisions fell under the authority of the thoughtful figure who was Pope Paul VI. In church history it is dangerous to make early and strong judgments. There are however some important elements, important signs, central to the post-conciliar period. Following upon the pages on the two "conciliar popes" of Vatican II, this section of our presentation on the postconciliar pontificate of Paul VI shows church history and historical theology sliding into each other. We first of all delineate some significant historical and political elements; and then focus on the theological developments in the late 1960s and the 1970s.

1.1. *Church and Society*

In August 1964, still during Vatican II, Pope Paul VI promulgated the first of his eight encyclicals. It was at once his most programmatic encyclical, entitled *Ecclesiam suam*.[1] The key word in this encyclical would be the key word throughout his pontificate: dialogue. The pope, in his first encyclical, stressed dialogue both in the direction of intra-religious dialogue, and dialogue with the outside world. Here we will concentrate on the second aspect, because dialogue with the outside world typified the development of the Roman Catholic Church in this period as a whole. The openness to the outside world that the council had adopted took a variety of forms in the post-conciliar period. It was strikingly apparent in Pope Paul's becoming the first traveling Pope, a tradition that his successors would continue, but until then was basically unseen.

[1] Paul VI, 'Ecclesiam suam (August 6, 1964),' *AAS* 56 (1964), 609–59.

The list of Pope Paul VI's pastoral visits outside Italy details the travels of the first pope to leave Italy since 1809. He was the first to visit the Western Hemisphere, Africa, and Asia during his pontificate. He visited six continents, and was the most travelled pope in history up to that time, earning the nickname "the Pilgrim Pope." With his travels he opened new avenues for the papacy, which were continued by his successors, Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI. He traveled to Jordan and the Holy Land in 1964 where he met with the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras[2] in Jerusalem, which led to rescinding the excommunications of the 1054 Great Schism on December 7, 1965—the next to last day of Vatican II.[3] Paul VI traveled as well to the Eucharistic Congresses in Bombay, India and Bogotá, Colombia. During the first papal visit to the United States in October 1965, he met with President Lyndon B. Johnson and addressed the United Nations in New York. Fifty years after the first apparition at Fátima, in Portugal, he visited the shrine in Fátima, in 1967. He undertook a pastoral visit to Africa in 1969.

In 1970 he travelled to several Asian and Pacific nations: Iran, East Pakistan (now Bangladesh), the Philippines, American Samoa (stopover in Pago Pago), Samoa, Australia, Indonesia, Hong Kong, and Ceylon. The pope's last international trip took him to nine countries. He met several heads of state including Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi of Iran, President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines, the O le Ao o le Malo of Samoa Malietoa Tanumafili II, Governor-General Paul Hasluck of Australia, and President Suharto of Indonesia. On November 27, 1970 the pope was the target of an assassination attempt at Manila International Airport in the Philippines.

A striking point in this whole dialogue and travel program was that of the ecclesiastical *Ostpolitik*. In particular, with regards to the smoothening of relations between Rome and the regimes behind the Iron Curtain that had already begun under John XXIII, Paul VI continued the political line set out by his predecessor, as the older course that had been charted by Pope Pius XI

---

[2] Valeria Martano, *Athenagoras il patriarca, 1886–1972: Un cristiano fra crisi della coabitazione e utopia ecumenica* [TRSR: N.S. 17] (Bologna, 1996).

[3] *Tomos Agapès: Vatican—Phanar, 1958–1970* (Rome & Istanbul, 1970), n° 127. Also see the collection of documents edited by Edward J. Stormon, *Towards the healing of schism: The Sees of Rome and Constantinople: Public Statements and Correspondence between the Holy See and the Ecumenical Patriarchate, 1958–1984* [Ecumenical Documents 3] (New York, 1987). On the importance and the aftermath of this decision for Catholic-Orthodox relationships, see Karim Schelkens, 'Envisager la concélébration entre catholiques et orthodoxes?' *Istina* 57 (2012), 253–77.

in 1937 with his encyclical *Divini redemptoris* was slipping into the past.[4] This was a radical shift. All the while, in intellectual environments in Western Europe, the United States, and in Latin America, communism was increasingly seen as a foundation for political theory and action. Even among Christian thinkers this raised expectations. While the unconditional rejection of communism that had been so characteristic of Vatican policy gave way to discrete negotiations, in particular the Secretary of State, Cardinal Agostino Casaroli,[5] would play a role of immense political significance. All of this constituted a de facto application of the vision of religious freedom which was put forward in *Dignitatis humanae*.

In practice Rome now negotiated with individual regimes (e.g. Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Hungary) about episcopal appointments and on the rights of Catholics. Leaving the earlier unequivocal condemnation had a more ambiguous position as a result. The attitude of the church would henceforth be determined case by case, and state by state. This shaped a less clear-cut and more complex attitude, which among believers often led to confusion about the church's position. An ecclesiastical *Realpolitik* developed, while it was obvious that negotiating with the People's Republic of China required a different approach than dealing with Moscow or Prague. All this keeping in mind the political posture the pope had already assumed in his speech to the United Nations in New York, in 1965: the emphasis was on dialogue and international cooperation for peace.

This same attitude, and Montini's personal dislike of fascism, brought Pope Paul increasingly at odds with the right-wing regime of General Franco in Spain. Paul VI felt compelled to criticize a regime where church and state were too closely identified. From 1968 on, he increasingly ordered the Spanish regime not to interfere with episcopal appointments and people's democratic rights. The attitude of the church in this period was caught up in tensions between the political left and right, a tension we saw in Leo XIII but was strongly affirmed now by Paul VI in 1971, with his apostolic letter *Octogesima adveniens.*[6] This attitude was not without its problems. So for instance dealing with communism as a political force

---

[4] Pius XI, 'Divini redemptoris (March 19, 1937),' *AAS* 29 (1937), 65–106.

[5] Casaroli had already been active under his predecessors at the State Secretariat, Cardinals Amleto Giovanni Cicognani and Jean-Marie Villot. See Agostino Casaroli, *Il martirio della pazienza: La Santa Sede e I paesi comunisti, 1963–89* (Turin, 2000).

[6] Paul VI, 'Octogesima Adveniens (May 14, 1971),' *AAS* 63 (1971), 401–41. At the same time, the document warned firmly against the risk of adopting marxist social analysis, explaining that the method could never be separated duly from the ideology.

hit Italian domestic politics, and Rome was forced to clarify its position. Leaving aside the extremely short pontificate of John Paul I, Paul VI was the last Italian pope, and therefore the last one with personal ties and issues fostered by Italian domestic politics: His own father had been active in the *Partito Popolare*, that Mussolini abolished. As a student, Montini had been involved in the student movement *FUCI*; and he closely knew the policy makers of the new party *Democrazia Cristiana*. Again, however, the position of the pope was moderate and nuanced, and when *Democrazia Cristiana* moved left, he disasociated himself.[7] Still, it was especially under the Italian far left that the pope would suffer. The actions of the Italian Red Brigades resulted in the murder of Pope Paul's friend, the politician Aldo Moro: for Paul VI a source of great personal grief.

The connection with Vatican II and the difficult development of an ecclesiastical dialogue with the modern world, in the second half of the 1960s, was not limited to just the diplomatic and political level. One of the foremost courses set under Paul VI and unflinchingly sustained was the conversation with other Christian churches and communities, as well as with other beliefs. The latter included both the non-Christian religions—especially Judaism—and philosophical atheism. The latter received special attention, quite early in the pontificate, with the establishment of a Secretariat (later Council) for non-believers, which in 1993 would be absorbed by the Pontifical Council for Culture.

Before the council, atheism had only attracted the attention of a few individuals, such as the theologian Henri de Lubac, whose book *Le drame de l'humanisme athée* had been released during the war.[8] Now, in the second half of the 1960s, philosophical atheism took on proportions that were historically unprecedented. Especially in Western Europe, the wave of secularization had a huge impact on the life of the Catholic Church and won the ideological atheism terrain among those who had left the church. At the same time a gradually evolving post-Christian population, with often an abiding interest in philosophy, was being attracted to other—often Oriental—forms of religious experience. We will return to this later, but the dramatic decline in priestly vocations and the collapse

[7] Eliana Versace, *Montini e l'apertura a sinistra: Il falso mito del vescovo progressista* (Milano, 2007), pp. 137–41.

[8] In *Le drame de l'humanisme athée* (Paris, 1944), de Lubac elaborately discussed the dramatic importance of nineteenth-century philosophers Ludwig Feuerbach, Friedrich Nietzsche, Auguste Comte, and Karl Marx for contemporary Western society and for the Christian thought-system as such.

of Western European churches also forced the church to reflect on its attitude towards other traditions. Especially in the West, atheism, often in conjunction with the already mentioned communism, was becoming a huge success.

Building on the intuition of his predecessor, Paul VI often directed his messages to all humankind, especially where social issues were concerned. In this context, the importance of *Populorum progressio*, issued in March 1967, cannot be overestimated.[9] This encyclical, which was seamlessly connected to the creation of a Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace on January 6, 1967, demonstrated once again Paul VI's strong focus on social questions. Here the pope indicated that the social question was no longer a local, but had become a universal issue, one that concerns all of humanity. He called upon all people of good will, reminiscent of the attitude of John XXIII. Labor problems such as the right to a fair wage, international solidarity, and development were high on the agenda. Even the pressing issue of overpopulation did not escape the pope. The concern for poverty in a de-colonialized world marked this pope, who, during the council, as a symbolic act, had given the papal tiara to the poor.

Now, however, especially within the Latin American context—and often with the support of the Latin American Episcopal Conference (CELAM), *Populorum progressio* was seen as an opportunity for forcefully overthrowing dictatorial and corrupt regimes. Such a call was strongly supported by the rising liberation theology, which had a strong impact on the Conference of CELAM in Medellín in 1968, where the bishops acted in line with the church of the poor group of Vatican II, and also adopted the Gustavo Gutiérrez "preferential option for the poor."[10] It is during this pontificate, and especially in the period after Medellín, that many of the causes of the subsequent conflict with liberation theology took root, and some of the most prominent liberation theologians published their main works. Consider in this context: Gutiérrez's groundbreaking 1971 work *Teología de la liberación* that explains the notion of Christian poverty as an act of loving solidarity with the poor as well as a liberating protest against poverty.[11]

---

[9] Paul VI, 'Populorum Progressio (March 26, 1967),' *AAS* 59 (1967), 257–99.

[10] Silvia Scatena, *In populo pauperum: La chiesa latinoamericana dal concilio a Medellín, 1962–1968* (Bologna, 2007).

[11] This would become the central thought in the Latin American liberation theology movement that would eventually inspire other and plural "theologies of liberation" developed in a multitude of contexts worldwide. See the English edition of the book that appeared in 1973, Gustavo Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation: History Politics and Salvation* (New York, 1973). In the eyes of the Vatican the combination of marxist social analysis with

In the aftermath of this book, Leonardo Boff's *Teologia do cativeiro e do libertaçao*[12] must also to be mentioned.

2. *Discovering the Religious Other*

Regardless how thoughtfully this pontificate dealt with political issues, the level of interreligious dialogue in the first decade after the council was one of the most significant periods in modern church history.[13] First, one must consider the changed posture towards other Christian communities. After a time of careful ecumenical steps taken by the Roman Catholic Church, Pope Paul VI chose quite freely to talk with the religiously other. Following the promulgation of *Unitatis redintegratio* in 1964[14] it was clear that the Secretariat for Christian Unity would not be just a conciliar body but a permanent part of the Roman Curia. With the curial reform of 1968 it would get a permanent statute. Under Pope Paul a multitude of official bilateral and multilateral dialogues were established, with the communities of the Reformation as well as Orthodox churches. Moreover, in the aftermath of the council, serious efforts led to an Ecumenical Directory,[15] with great attention to the local anchoring of ecumenical thought and action.

On a global ecumenical level, changes introduced under Pope Paul are still having a contemporary impact. The relationship with the World Council of Churches in Geneva was formalized; and we recall the pope's memorable visit to the headquarters of the World Council on 10 September 1969. With papal support, starting in 1965, a Joint Working Group began investigating the option for possible membership of the Roman Catholic Church in the World Council. This possibility collapsed in 1972,[16] due in part to course changes in the WCC after the Assembly in Uppsala in 1968.

---

biblical images proves to be highly suspicous, as will be made in clear in chapter seven of this book.

[12] Leonardo Boff, *Teologia do cativeiro e do libertaçao* (Lissabon, 1976).

[13] Cf. Willi Henkel, 'Der interreligiöse Dialog seit dem II. Vatikanischen Konzil nach den Dokumenten des kirchlichen Lehramtes,' in *Die Weite des Mysteriums: Christliche Identität im Dialog* (Freiburg, 2000), pp. 366–76.

[14] Vatican II, 'Unitatis redintegratio (November 21, 1964),' *AAS* 57 (1965), 90–112.

[15] The *Directorium oecumenicum* was prepared in several stages, the first of which led to the publication of the initial *Directory for the Application of the Decisions of the Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican Concerning Ecumenical Matters* (London, 1967).

[16] Jan Grootaers, *Rome et Genève à la croisée des chemins, 1968–1972: Un ordre du jour inachevé* (Paris, 2005).

Nevertheless, even though the Roman Catholic Church is not a member of the WCC, it is a full member of the Faith and Order Commission. The Roman Catholic Church also serves on the Team on Mission and Unity in a consultative capacity, and sponsors a faculty appointment and spiritual support at the Bossey Ecumenical Institute. Through the Pontifical Council for Promoting Interreligious Dialogue, the Roman Catholic Church works with the WCC Team on Interreligious Dialogue and Cooperation.

Certainly other significant developments have been the preparation of documents that between 1968 and 1980 were prepared by representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council in the context of the Commission for Society, Development and Peace (SoDePax). Particularly noteworthy was the March 1966 meeting between Pope Paul VI and the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Michael Ramsey, which to some extent can be interpreted as a vindication of the curtailed Malines Conversations under Pope Pius XI. Official dialogue with Anglicanism now resumed with the launching of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) in 1969, a process still very much in motion today. Two years earlier official contacts had been established with the World Methodist Council, and already, during Vatican II, official discussions had begun with the Lutheran World Federation.

Most striking has been the steady Roman Catholic rapprochement with the Orthodox world, both the Eastern Orthodox and the Oriental Orthodox Churches. In this context, a key element has been the Dialogue of Charity between Rome and the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. Since the abolition, on the second to last day of Vatican II, of the 1054 mutual excommunications between Patriarch Cerularius and Cardinal Umberto of Silva Candida, relationships between Rome and Constantinople have seen spectacular improvement. Paul VI instituted, in his courageous letter to Patriarch Athenagoras *Anno ineunte* in 1967 the term "sister churches."[17] In the same year, Paul VI, who had first met with Athenagoras in 1964, visited again with Patriarch Athenagoras, launching official exchanges up until the death of Athenagoras in 1972. Paul VI had once said in a private conversation that, if necessary to bring about full communion between the two churches, "he would travel to the North Pole."[18] In addition to relationships with other Christian denominations, the post-conciliar era, more than any period in the history of the church, has also been marked

[17] Paul VI, 'Anno Ineunte (July 25, 1967),' *AAS* 59 (1967), 852–4.
[18] Quoted in Karim Schelkens, 'Envisager la concélébration,' 253–77.

by a genuine openness to dialogue and respectful relationships with other religious traditions. Under Paul VI, attention to Eastern traditions was sparsely present, but attention to other religions, as expressed especially in *Nostra aetate*, took a prominent Roman Catholic place with the establishment of the Secretariat for Non-Christians in 1964; and the commitment of Rome would be sustained. On August 1, 1969 Pope Paul gave a remarkable speech to the representatives of Islam in Uganda. The pope stressed that "Our pilgrimage to these holy places is not for purposes of prestige or power. It is a humble and ardent prayer for peace, through the intercession of the glorious Protectors of Africa, who gave up their lives for love and for their belief. In recalling the Catholic and Anglican Martyrs, We gladly recall also those confessors of the Moslem faith who were the first to suffer death, in the year eighteen hundred and forty-eight, for refusing to transgress the precepts of their religion." Statements such as these are significant for a policy that focuses on a conciliatory attitude towards the other Abrahamic religions.

Another striking aspect is and remains a profound reconciliation with Judaism. Falling under the competence of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, a separate section was established, known as of 1974 as the Pontifical Commission for Religious Relationships with the Jews. In the aftermath of the often very tense and politically-charged debate on this issue during Vatican II, but since he also had been a substitute of the Vatican Secretariat of State under Pius XII, Montini was always very conscious of the historically-laden nature of the problem. One sees again the remarkable sensitivity of this pope, to the scandal of anti-semitism, when he established a commission, that worked from 1965 to his death on the eleven volumes of *Acts and Documents of the Holy See Relative to the Second World War.*

3. *A Multifaceted Crisis: The Difficult Implementation of the Council*

The Second Vatican Council generated feelings of euphoria for many believers, theologians, and bishops. Especially in the West, and in large sections of the population, there was a spirit of optimism and forward thinking. Much of this led to the social movements of May 1968. These hopes, however, would soon change. The balance shifted and a new religious crisis was on the horizon.[19] The implementation of the

[19] Cf. the upcoming book *Timoniere in tempi difficili: Paolo VI e la crisi postconciliare*, ed. Jörg Ernesti [Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Paolo VI] (Brescia, 2013). Also see Alberto Melloni,

conciliar decrees had not been the great boon that some had anticipated and desired.

On January 3, 1966, just a month after the close of Vatican II, Pope Paul VI set up a series of commissions for the implementation of the conciliar decisions. Their mission, however, was to be accomplished in close collaboration with the Roman dicasteries, whose composition and atmosphere were often the same as before the council. This was the start of a difficult process and an increasing atmosphere of crisis. It was, however, not just one crisis, but a multitude of crisis factors, all inter-linked with each other. In no small measure it was the legacy of the council itself that was at stake, as a strong chorus called out about the correct interpretation of the council.

In what follows, we discuss a number of striking elements of this interlinked crisis: at the level of the universal government of the church, at the level of the liturgical reform and tensions with the local churches, and at the level of theological developments.

3.1. *Collegial Governance, Synodality and the Roman Curia*

Soon after the council, Pope Paul VI started carrying out a series of important appointments within the Roman curia, as an immediate effect of the council.[20] Also, in August 1966, Pope Paul issued his *motu proprio Ecclesiae sanctae*.[21] It was intended as a real impetus for conciliar implementation in terms of church organization and structures. Very practical measures, such as the duty of bishops to offer their resignation at age 75, were included. In the years that followed, the pope would stress the ecclesiology of *Lumen gentium* and the council's Decree on the Pastoral Charge of the Bishops *Christus dominus*[22] as the basis for concrete decisions. One of the most striking elements would be the structure of the episcopal synods,

---

'Gli anni settanta della chiesa cattolica. La complessità nella ricezione del Concilio,' in *L'Italia repubblicana nella crisi degli anni Settanta*, ed. Fiamma Lussana and Giacomo Marramao (Rome, 2003), pp. 201–29.

[20] A series of important high officials were appointed, placing Cardinal Gabriel-Marie Garrone at the head of the Congregation for Seminaries and Universities; Cardinal Franjo Seper at the head of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Cardinal Jean-Marie Villot as prefect of the Congregation for the Council; Cardinal Maximilien de Furstenberg as prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches; and Cardinal John Wright at the head of the Congregation for the Clergy.

[21] Paul VI, 'Ecclesiae sanctae (August 6),' *AAS* 58 (1966), 757–87.

[22] Vatican II, 'Christus dominus (October 28, 1965),' *AAS* 58 (1966), 673–96. For the redactional itinerary of this decree, see Massimo Faggioli's *Il vescovo e il concilio: Modello episcopale e aggiornamento al Vaticano II* [TRSR 36] (Bologna, 2005).

of which the first four ordinary synods were held during the papacy of Pope Paul VI. The germ of the post-conciliar developments, in terms of synodality, lies in this period. The basic principle was developed by the council fathers, inspired by the early church and the Eastern traditions, enabling bishops to participate in the governance of the universal Church. In this sense, the notion of synodality was linked from the outset to the doctrine of collegiality, as formulated in the much-discussed third chapter of *Lumen gentium*.[23] Right from the outset this bumped against practical applicability obstacles; and gradually a tension would be felt between what is called "affective" collegiality and "effective" collegiality.[24] While the latter requires actual participation of the episcopate in the universal governance in the church, the focus has shifted more and more to a reduction of collegiality to the "affective" collegial sentiment in which bishops are supposed to collaborate with one another and with the Supreme Pontif. As a consequence, collegiality is no longer understood as an effort to reduce centralist tendencies in Roman Catholic church governance.

Another inhibiting factor in the development of synodal peer decision-making concerned the role of cardinals in the Roman Catholic Church. As we have pointed out before, nowhere in the documents of Vatican II, are cardinals mentioned. Church doctrine, in Vatican II, has a strong sacramental basis. Cardinality, however, originally simply an honorary function, has no sacramental foundation or structure. Yet, although a new code was under preparation, the ecclesiastical reforms of the council had to be conducted under the legal umbrella of the 1917 Code of Canon Law. And, certainly in its second part, the Pio-Benedictine Code still used the model of the church as *societas perfecta* and reserved a central role for cardinals in the universal government of the church. The result was not only the existence of two, difficult to combine, ecclesiological models, but immediately problematic governance structures. The old curial structure was barely affected, making it more difficult for new organization structures to get a foothold. Somewhat apart from the Roman Curia were the bishops, who by way of the synods were given an advisory function, as

[23] Regarding the important notion of synodality as an element of reform, see Hervé Legrand, 'Synodes et conseils de l'après-concile,' *NRT* (1976), 193–216.

[24] In this regard see the remark made by Jérôme Hamer, who argued that the "affectus collegialis è manifestamente una realtà effettiva, una realtà che opera," in *Carnets conciliaires de Mgr. Gérard Philips, secrétaire adjoint de la commission doctrinale*, ed. Karim Schelkens [IT 29] (Leuven, 2006), p. xiii.

already stipulated in the motu proprio *Apostolica sollicitudo*, on 15 September 1965.[25]

The daily administration of the church, therefore, remained in the hands of the Roman Curia, under the central leadership of the pope. This was already seen in the interpretation of episcopal collegiality. The first synod took place in 1967. This synod, lasting from 29 September to 29 October, expressed a number of concerns and covered a wide range of topics, including liturgical reforms, the crisis of handing-on the faith, mixed marriages, and the reform of canon law. Meeting in Rome precisely at the same time as this synod was an international conference organized by the laity. This conference underlined the aftermath of the council and the need for quick church reform.

The Synod of 1971 was already quite strongly marked by an atmosphere of crisis. Now, attention was on the priesthood and the theme of justice. The third synod in 1974, switched to evangelization. Finally and still under Paul VI, there was a 1977 synod held on catechesis. Other elements of post conciliar reform cannot go unmentioned. There was the reform of the Roman Curia in accordance with *Regimini universae ecclesiae.*[26] This document issued in 1967, would go into effect a year later and call for a reorganization of the central governing body of the Roman Catholic Church in a very practical way. The curia would now be composed of four types of organs: congregations, secretariats, tribunals, and councils.[27] In view of a real reception of the council this reorganization was not insignificant. At Vatican II, in 1963, there had been a sharp debate, with attacks on the functioning of the Roman Curia and in particular its alienation from the local church. Henceforth the appointment of curial members would be for five-year terms. Moreover, this reform would be important for the public face of the Catholic Church in particular because some of the listed secretariats (for Unity, for Non-Christians and Non-Believers)

---

[25] Paul VI, 'Apostolica sollicitudo (September 15, 1965),' *AAS* 57 (1965), 775–80. For a survey and an analysis of the Synods held since Vatican II, see Jan Grootaers, *Heurs et malheurs de la collégialité: Pontificats et synodes face à la réception de Vatican II* [ANL 69] (Louvain, 2012).

[26] Paul VI, 'Regimini ecclesiae universae (August 15, 1967),' *AAS* 59 (1967), 885–928.

[27] On the curial reform of 1968, see Philippe Chenaux, 'La réception du Concile Vatican II dans la curie romaine,' in *The Transformation of Christian Churches in Western Europe, 1945–2000*, ed. Leo Kenis, Jaak Billiet, and Patrick Pasture (Louvain, 2010), pp. 255–66. Also see the article by Lucas Moreira Neves, 'Paul VI et la réforme de la curie,' *Notiziario dell'Istituto Paolo VI* 8 (1984), 51–66.

received a formal identity. Furthermore, the internal functioning of each of these institutions was regulated in detail.

Closely linked to the reform of the Roman Curia were other important issues: On June 14, 1966 Paul VI officially set aside the Index of Prohibited Books; and a year later he announced the establishment of the International Theological Commission. The actual start of it, however, would only take place in 1969, and the initiative came as a way of seeking expert theological support for official church decisions about theological issues. The first generation members of this International Theological Commission included an impressive number of conciliar theologians who, at one time, had all been adherents to the conciliar majority: Karl Rahner, Yves Congar, Henri de Lubac, Gerard Philips, and Joseph Ratzinger.

All these reforms had an undeniable impact. Following the close of Vatican II, however, other less reformist initiatives circulated under Paul VI. Thus, several proposals for a draft of an ecclesiastical constitution, organizing the centralizing tendencies within Roman Catholicism in a *Lex ecclesiae fundamentalis* were discussed but didn't go anywhere. There was broad opposition to this plan, among others due to the difficulty of integrating church juridical thought with a number of church models still reflecting the pre-conciliar *societas perfecta* model of church. The post-conciliar reforms under Pope Paul VI, on many fronts at the same time, could not prevent the post-conciliar church from moving into a sense of crisis that would mark several pontificates. In what follows, we focus on further elements of this crisis.

3.2. *The Liturgical Crisis*

One of the earliest elements of conciliar implementation was of course the implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum concilium*.[28] Even before all the official implementation had begun, local liturgical renewal initiatives, around the world, had started. Not infrequently these went beyond the intentions of conciliar teaching. On January 25, 1964, exactly five years after the announcement of the council by his predecessor, and along with the official publication of the conciliar constitution in the *Acta apostolicae sedis*, Paul VI promulgated the motu

[28] Vatican II, 'Sacrosanctum concilium (December 4, 1963),' *AAS* 56 (1964), 97–139. On the relationship between the council document and the preconciliar encyclical by Pius XII, see Aidan Nichols, *A Pope and a Council on the Sacred Liturgy: A Tale of Two Documents* (Farnborough, 2002).

proprio *Sacram liturgiam*[29] which led to the establishment of a *Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra liturgia*. The leadership of this council for liturgical implementation lay in the hands of the Bolognese Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro and the counsel's secretary Annibale Bugnini.[30] This soon created tension between the counsel and the Roman Congregation of Rites. The tension between the two bodies was palpable and could only end with the curial reform: the two were merged into one dicastery. Meanwhile Paul VI also decided, just before the opening of the last session of the council, in early September 1965, to issue an encyclical on the mystery of the Eucharist, entitled *Mysterium fidei*.[31] The reason for this was the development, among theologians in the Netherlands, moving from the classical doctrine of "transsubstantiation" to a theology of "transsignification." This reaction from Rome aroused widespread surprise, because the encyclical indicated that theological language could not simply be changed and that theological discourse about the Eucharist had to connect with the traditional language regarding the eucharistic mystery. The *aggiornamento* of John XXIII seemingly clashed here with the limiting language of his successor. All this indicates what a high voltage issue liturgical renewal was—right from the start. The tension during and immediately after the council also severely complicated the process of local implementation of the liturgical renewal.[32] The most tangible results of this innovation for average believers—after the two bodies had published a new ritual in January 1965—was undoubtedly the introduction of the vernacular, communion under both species, and the emphasis on the active participation of the faithful, all, since long ago, aspirations of the liturgical movement. In 1967 and 1970 new instructions followed; but the highlight of the liturgical reform was undoubtedly the publication of the new *Missale romanum* of Paul VI in 1970.[33]

---

[29] Paul VI, 'Sacram liturgiam (January 25, 1964),' *AAS* 56 (1964), 139–44.

[30] Piero Marini, *A Challenging Reform: Realizing the Vision of the Liturgical Renewal* (Collegeville, 2007). See Bugnini's own monograph in *La riforma liturgica, 1948–1975* [Bibliotheca ephemerides liturgicae: Subsidia 30] (Rome, 1983). On Lercaro, see Nicla Buonasorte, 'Una vita liturgica: Giacomo Lercaro, 1891–1976,' *Rivista liturgica* 1 (2006), 119–32.

[31] Paul VI, 'Mysterium fidei (September 3, 1965),' *AAS* 57 (1965), 753–74.

[32] Cf. *The Active Participation Revisited—La participation active: 100 ans après Pie X et 40 ans après Vatican II*, ed. Jozef Lamberts [Textes et études liturgiques 19] (Louvain, 2004).

[33] Paul VI announced the publication of his new Missal in the Apostolic Constitution *Missale romanum* of April 3, 1969. The Missal itself was officially promulgated by the pope on March 26, 1970. Moreover, the pope made it obligatory for use as soon as the local ordinaries had approved vernacular editions of it. Therefore, he installed as deadline November 28, 1971.

More and more, however, a dichotomy was clearly developing between local and experimental liturgies,[34] less and less bound to the missal of 1969, and, on the other side, a spectrum of sharp criticism that this new rite meant a betrayal of the "Tridentine Mass" of Pope Pius V. The pope himself insisted that the reformed liturgy was not a break-off from the past but rather a renewed connection to early Christianity's liturgical tradition.

3.3. *Crisis and Opposition*

Prominent historians like Philippe Chenaux have observed that the crisis was largely a crisis of faith and of passing on the faith.[35] Church membership declined noticeably, especially in Western Europe; and the number of priests dropped drastically. The conciliar dynamics, however, had widely fueled the hope that the Catholic Church could now be directed from a grassroots, democratic way. A striking case in point was the organization of the Dutch National Pastoral Council of Noordwijkerhout.[36]

Dutch Catholicism was fully engaged in renewal and wished to apply collegial cooperation at the local level.[37] In a broad representation from 1968 to 1970, consultations and discussions were held with a view toward church renewal in liturgy, ministry, the participation of laity, etc. Strikingly progressive decisions were taken on issues such as priestly celibacy, where the episcopacy committed itself to defending the possibility of married priests. The Dutch case typified a growing issue in the Western European church, where the permanent coupling of ordained ministry and celibacy was now being questioned.[38] In October 1965, Paul VI had excluded this issue from the conciliar agenda. It now returned as a real boomerang. The sense of the council that local bishops should be granted more autonomy led people to believe that the celibacy issue could be resolved locally. This became a high tension development for the pope, who still favored universal and centralized decision making. On 24 June

---

[34] Mathijs Lamberigts, 'Experiences of the Council's Reception: Liturgical Experiments in the Low Countries,' *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 32 (2000), 387–405.

[35] Cf. Chenaux, *Il Concilio Vaticano II* (Rome, 2012), pp. 129–33.

[36] See *Pastoraal Concilie van de Nederlandse kerkprovincie*, ed. Walter Goddijn, 7 Vols. (Amersfoort, 1970).

[37] For an English-written survey of Dutch Catholicism in this era, see John A. Coleman, *The Evolution of Dutch Catholicism, 1958–1974* (Berkeley, 1978).

[38] See Jan Jacobs, *Die Niederlände*, in *Kirche und Katholizismus seit 1945*, ed. Erwin Gatz (Paderborn, 1998), 1:243–74.

1967, Pope Paul issued his encyclical *Sacerdotalis coelibatus*.[39] Contrary to what Rome had expected, this encyclical, calling for the retention of mandatory celibacy, was very poorly received. In the Netherlands, the Pastoral Council, under the influence of Edward Schillebeeckx, called for the separation of ordained ministry and mandatory celibacy. The whole debate became more and more heated and focused on tensions between central authority and an exercise of local authority, with collegiality issues as the theological undercurrent. In the background played the issue surrounding the Dutch Catechism, which had appeared in 1966, under the title *De Nieuwe Katechismus* (The New Catechism),[40] and was largely influenced by the thinking of the Dutch Jesuit theologian Piet Schoonenberg. The document abandoned the old "Question and Answer" style, and sought to propose the faith in contemporary language; but it was soon criticized by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. At a three day gathering in Gazzada in April 1967 representatives from the Roman Curia entered into conversation with Schoonenberg, Edward Schillebeeckx and Willem Bless, three theologians appointed by the archbishop of Utrecht, Cardinal Bernard Jan Alfrink. In June of that year, a commission of cardinals decided that a revision of the Catechism was required. Cardinal Alfrink, however, only agreed to publish the proposed corrections in a separate annex, rather than to adapt the text of the New Catechism. Ultimately, on October 15, 1968, four months after the bestselling book *Il dossier del Catechismo Olandese* had appeared,[41] the authors received a letter from Rome forcing them to revise the catechism on a series of items.[42]

In this setting, the Holy See gradually wielded episcopal appointments as the ultimate weapon. Following the radically liberal decisions taken in the Netherlands, and against the wishes of the people and the Dutch bishops, in 1970 Rome appointed Adrianus Simonis as Bishop of Rotterdam. Two years later Pope Paul appointed Johannes Gijsen as bishop of Roermond. After his resignation in 1993, Gijsen was moved, in 1996, to the Diocese of Reykjavík in Iceland. Simonis had a major impact on the

---

[39] Paul VI, 'Sacerdotalis coelibatus (June 24, 1967),' *AAS* 59 (1967), 657–97.

[40] *De Nieuwe Katechismus: Geloofsverkondiging voor volwassenen* (Antwerp, 's-Hertogenbosch, Roermond and Maaseik, 1966).

[41] *Il dossier del Catechismo Olandese*, ed. Aldo Chiaruttini (Milan, 1968). See also *Witboek over de Nieuwe Katechismus*, ed. Willem Bless (Utrecht, 1969).

[42] 'Commissio cardinalitia de novo catechismo (De Nieuwe Katechismus): Declaratio (October 15, 1968),' *AAS* 60 (1968), 685–91. The cardinals who signed were Joseph Frings, Joseph-Charles Lefèbvre, Lorenz Jäger, Ermenegildo Florit, Michael Browne and Charles Journet.

Dutch church. He became Archbishop of Utrecht in 1983, was a major supporter of Pope John Paul II's eventful visit to the Netherlands in 1985; and he was elevated to the college of cardinals during the consistory of 25 May 1985. But, the Rome-dictated episcopal appointments led to greater polarization and growing sentiments that Rome was working against the local church.

In fact, seen globally, Rome's episcopal appointments were not as one-sidedly conservative as some thought. An important case in point involved the United States of America. In 1973, Pope Paul VI appointed the Belgian Archbishop Jean Jadot as Apostolic Delegate for the United States. The pope had told Jadot that most American bishops were more big businessmen than pastors and it was time for a change. Jadot selected a whole generation of American bishops who were in sync with Vatican II. The new ways of Jadot were soon the talk of Washington. In his seven years as Apostolic Delegate, he was responsible for the appointments of 103 new bishops and the assignments of 15 archbishops. His flock of more progressive-minded bishops came to be known as "the Jadot boys."[43]

The governance crisis in the church, however, was hardly over. Prominent theologians like Hans Küng were openly critical of Rome. In widely read books like Küng's *Infallible*, the papal magisterium received historic perspective and sharp and critical analysis.[44] Küng's position was already well known before the publication of his book and he had had great influence on the growing atmosphere calling for decentralization and emphasis on the importance of the local churches. Especially noteworthy in this perspective was the second symposium of European bishops, from 7 to 10 July in 1969 in Chur, Switzerland, devoted to ministry issues. The Belgian Cardinal Suenens was prominently present, and during his closing speech, read an 'express letter' from Hans Küng stressing the notions of collegiality and coresponsibility in the universal government of the church. All of this took place on the eve of the Synod of 1969, which provided a test case for synodal reception of Vatican II.[45] The impact and pressure was so

[43] Among them were bishops Kenneth Untner (Saginaw), William Borders (Baltimore), Patrick Flores (San Antonio), Peter Gerety (Newark), James Hickey (Washington DC), Raymond Hunthausen (Seattle), John Quinn (San Francisco), John Roach (Saint Paul), Charles Salatka (Oklahoma City), Robert Sanchez (Santa Fe), and Rembert Weakland (Milwaukee).

[44] Hans Küng, *Unfehlbar? Eine Anfrage* (Zürich, 1970). The book appeared in English translation as *Infallible? An Inquiry* (New York, 1971).

[45] Joseph Famerée, 'La collégialité au synode extraordinaire de 1969: Un premier conflit d'interprétation de Vatican II,' in *L'Autorité et les autorités: L'herméneutique théologique*

great that Cardinal Wright, of the Congregation for the Clergy, was forced to hold a special meeting of synod fathers, apart from the synod, to deal with the ministry crisis. Even this did not help. Then, in the same year of 1969 came the icing on the cake: Cardinal Suenens gave a widely and unfavorably received interview in which he accused the pope of a lack of collegial governance. The Synod of 1971 finally came back to the problem and Paul VI offered two options. One was the possibility of change; and the second was the integral conservation of existing regulations about ordained ministry and celibacy. The latter was approved by the Synod, by a majority vote.[46]

Suenens's widespread criticism touched on another thorny issue of the crisis: the Catholic church's attitude vis-à-vis sexual morality, and especially birth control. This point Montini had also withdrawn from conciliar debates and entrusted to a special pontifical commission. It is not the place here to go into the complex history of the pontifical commission. Nevertheless, it is an historic fact that Paul VI set aside the vote of the committee, that had leaked into the press. In his encyclical *Humanae vitae*, which is much broader and much richer in content than simply the question of birth control, the pope reaffirmed the negative position that his predecessor Pius XI had stated in his 1930 encyclical *Casti connubii*.[47]

Humanae vitae was released in July 1968, when the sexual revolution was at a high point. More than the celibacy issue, this encyclical was rejected by broad sections of the faithful and their local ordinaries in Europe, the United States, and Latin America. Balanced conciliar theologians like Gerard Philips prepared counter-reactions, on behalf of their bishops. From the United States came the so-called Washington Statement, signed by 600 prominent American Catholics. And more opposition came from German circles. The organization of a special synod in 1969 dedicated to the interpretation of the doctrine of collegiality offered no solace; and precisely this point would stretch on for decades. Increasingly people referred to the argument of the Austrian bishops led by Cardinal König, stating in a negative way that the encyclical was "not infallible"

---

de Vatican II, ed. Gilles Routhier and Guy Jobin [Unam sanctam: N.S. 3] (Paris, 2010), pp. 95–123.

[46] More details on the role of Pope Paul VI in this are found in Youssef Sarraf, *La partecipazione di Paolo VI ai sinodi dei vescovi*, in Istituto Paolo VI, *Paolo VI e la collegialità episcopale*, pp. 112–4.

[47] Pius XI, 'Casti connubii (December 31, 1930),' *AAS* 22 (1930), 543–55.

doctrine, and therefore non-compliance could not be regarded as a mortal sin. In retrospect, examining this encyclical historiographically, König's point proved correct and it is hard deny the established fact that, at the initiative of the pope himself, the wording "*infallibili magisterio docemus*" was removed from the text before the promulgation of the encyclical. The reactions to *Humanae vitae* were nevertheless devastating and widespread; and the impact on Paul VI was great. Until his death in 1978, a full decade of his pontificate, Pope Paul issued no more encyclicals.

Of no small influence on all this was a growing discord in the theological world, whose foundation was in the conciliar debates. This in many ways. There was the emergence of a number of new religious movements, in this time of crisis, which reacted against the excessive optimism of the conciliar period. Already founded in Madrid in 1964 was the Neocatechumenal Way, also known as the neocatechumenate. In Italy after 1968 one sees two particularly influential movements emerging: Communion and Liberation and Sant'Egidio. There were other indications of change as well. At the end of the Second Vatican Council, in 1965, a group of theologians including Congar, Schillebeeckx, Küng, Johann Baptist Metz, and Karl Rahner established the international journal *Concilium* for theological dialogue and continuing the legacy of the council.[48] It stressed in particular the positions of the conciliar majority and the emphasis was on doing justice to the "spirit" of the council. Increasingly, however, members of this group ended up in opposition to Roman decisions and especially Küng and Schillebeeckx encountered serious opposition from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, which in 1968 was led by Cardinal Franjo Seper. Schillebeeckx and Metz would also gradually become more engaged in political theology, and closely linked to trends in Latin American liberation theology.

In this context, one must also mention the German Reformed theologian Jürgen Moltmann and his theology of hope.[49] Like Moltmann, the Catholic theologian Johann Baptist Metz put eschatological thinking on center stage. A Christian should find hope in the future even when experiencing much discontentment with the way the world is now. For

---

[48] On the origins of the periodical, see the study of Hadewijch Snijdewind, 'Genèse et organisation de la revue internationale de théologie Concilium,' *CrSt* 21 (2000), 645–73.

[49] Jürgen Moltmann's *Theologie der Hoffnung: Untersuchungen zur Begründung und zu den Konsequenzen einer christlichen Eschatologie* (Munich, 1964), was heavily inspired by the "utopic" thinking the German philosopher Ernst Bloch had developed in his *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*. An English translation appeared under the title of Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope: On the Grounds and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology* (New York, 1967).

them the "eschatological reservation" became a core principle of theology. This principle allows the current situation of the church and the world to be treated critically. Moving from the inadequacy of the present situation, every theology asks a socially critical and church critical engagement.

Striking in this survey of theological protagonists is the great number of names from religious orders and congregations. There too the crisis had a major impact, with as illustrative example the Society of Jesus. After the 31st General Congregation of the Jesuits in 1966, the society had an increasingly strained relationship with the pope. The combination of a large decline in the society's membership and a growing emphasis on social engagement, under the inspiration of liberation theology, led to an ever greater distancing from papal authority. This problem persisted up to the rule of John Paul II; and certainly after the 32nd General Congregation of 1975 it led to an increased atmosphere of conflict and tension between the Jesuit General Pedro Arrupe and the pope.

Theological ranks were separating. In 1972 another journal appeared, which also wanted to connect to the legacy of the council, but following a less liberal line. Prominent among the founders of *Communio* was also a series of conciliar theologians, including Hans Urs von Balthasar, Joseph Ratzinger, and Henri de Lubac. A striking fact here is that these theologians initially belonged mainly to the conciliar majority. Now, however, in a period of crisis, which was proclaimed by the old Jacques Maritain in France as a crisis in comparison with which "the modernism of the time of Pius X was no more than mild hay fever,"[50] these theologians linked up with the church's central teaching authority. While some former representatives of the generation of theological innovators, like Marie-Dominique Chenu, continued preaching a more revolutionary message, other former colleagues, like Jean Daniélou and Henri de Lubac, signed a petition for adherence to the pope.

3.4. *Dissidence on the Right*

The image of the post-conciliar crisis cannot be a balanced picture, if one only focuses on criticism of papal decisions from the theological and ecclesiastical left. Strong criticism was coming from the Catholic right as well, and particularly from Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre.

---

[50] Jacques Maritain, *Le feu nouveau: Le paysan de la Garonne*, preface and critical edition by Michel Fourcade (Geneva, 2007), here p. 37. Quoted also in the excellent study on the postconciliar developments by Étienne Fouilloux, 'Essai sur le devenir du catholicisme en France et en Europe occidentale de Pie XII à Benoît XVI,' *RTL* 42 (2011), 526–57.

Lefebvre, French Archbishop of the the Senegalese Archdiocese of Dakar, and former Superior General of the Holy Ghost Fathers and former Apostolic Delegate for West Africa, had been appointed by Pope John XXIII a member of the Central Preparatory Commission for the Second Vatican Council. During the first period of the council (October to December 1962), he became concerned about the direction the council's deliberations were taking and took a leading role in the group of bishops at the council which became known as the *Coetus internationalis patrum*. An intransigent minority at the council, they ended up objecting to a number of conciliar decisions and teachings about: liturgical reform,[51] religious freedom, ecumenism, and interreligious dialogue. Separated from his congregation, and with the permission of the bishop of Fribourg, Lefebvre established the International Seminary of Saint Pius X at Ecône in the Valais Canton of Switzerland. Lefebvre and his followers explicitly distanced themselves from conciliar reforms and sought an active connection with preconciliar Catholicism.[52] The Mass of Paul VI, in force since 1969, was rejected, and the prevailing mindset was that of neo-Thomism and antimodernism. The Tridentine liturgy was the only liturgy accepted as valid. More and more the rhetoric of this group stressed that the Second Vatican Council was in fact a modernist council, and its results should be rejected as heretical.

In 1975, though Marcel Lefebvre had two meetings with a commission of cardinals, the new bishop of Fribourg dissolved the Fraternity of Saint Pius X. This action was subsequently upheld by Pope Paul VI, who a year later, criticized Archbishop Lefebvre by name and appealed to him and his followers to change their minds. On 29 June 1976, Lefebvre went ahead with planned priestly ordinations without the approval of the local bishop and despite receiving letters from Rome forbidding them.[53] He was later suspended *a divinis*, i.e., he could no longer legally administer any of the sacraments. Under Pope John Paul II, as we will see in the next chapter, Archbishop Lefebvre entered into full schism.

---

[51] This is still clear in recent publications from the side of the Pius X Fraternity, such as *Le problème de la réforme liturgique, la messe de Vatican II et de Paul VI, étude théologique et liturgique* (Étampes, 2001). Also see the study by Nicla Buonasorte, *Tra Roma e Lefebvre: Il tradizionalisme cattolico Italiano e il Concilio Vaticano II* (Rome, 2003).

[52] See, among the multitude of books published in the postconciliar realm, the volume by Marcel Lefebvre, *Cor Unum: Lettres et avis aux membres de la Fraternité, 1970–1989* (Paris, 1989).

[53] See the book devoted to the Lefebvrists by Yves Congar in that same year, under the title *La crise de l'église et Mgr. Lefebvre* (Paris, 1976).

CHAPTER SEVEN

FACING PLURALISM: CATHOLICISM FROM JOHN PAUL I TO BENEDICT XVI

1. *The Year of Three Popes*

Exactly a century after the death of Pope Pius IX, the year 1978 is widely known as "the year of the three popes."[1] Following the death of Pope Paul VI on August 6, his successor, Pope John Paul I, died surprisingly at the end of September, after only thirty-three days on the chair of Saint Peter. Finally, in October 1978, Pope John Paul II stood at the head of the Roman Catholic Church, and would lead the Catholic Church into the third millennium—a point to which the pontiff paid ample attention, as he himself stressed in his 2001 Apostolic Letter *Novo millennio ineunte* of 2001.[2]

John Paul II's death, in 2005, brought an end to a long, richly filled, and eventful pontificate. That he died just a few years ago has, of course, implications for this last chapter. Certainly any critical and balanced judgment by church historians requires a longer time frame for perspective and objective reflection. There are limitations therefore in evaluating the last two decades of Pope John Paul II's pontificate; and the authors are well aware of this fact. By no means can this chapter be presented as a final word regarding this recent pontificate, nor is it an attempt to do so. Nevertheless, we have thought it useful, keeping in mind the evolutions sketched in the previous chapter, to trace some of the important patterns in this very recent period in our church's history. This may also allow us to look at the last completed pontificate with fresh eyes, for the conclave of April 2005, brought in Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger as Pope Benedict XVI.

Benedict XVI inherited a church whose configurations worldwide were far more different than ever before: an existential and structural crisis in North America and Western Europe, where the church was being questioned on very pragmatic grounds, and a spiritual and numerical flowering

[1] Peter Hebblethwaite, *The Year of Three Popes* (London, 1978).
[2] John Paul II, 'Novo millennio ineunte (January 6, 2001),' *AAS* 93 (2001), 266–309.

in South America, Africa, and Southeast Asia, where the universal vision and approach of Rome often stood in stark contrast to the challenges being contextually determined. In particular for Western Europe and North America, the question of "the chicken or the egg" remains urgent: are social and ideological evolutions forcing the church to do more folding back on itself, or is it a too tightly controlled church leadership that is producing more "unchurched" flocks?

Like all complex realities, it may not be a question of an "either . . . or" but an "and. . . . and" situation with shared responsibility and high complementarity, but also with major consequences for both the church and for Western civilization.

Understanding the position of the Roman Catholic Church after Paul VI is a complex undertaking. Much of the experience of Western Catholicism would appear to be a prolongation of tendencies already set in motion under earlier pontificates. There was a severe drop in vocations to the priesthood and religious life. The overall age of the clergy increased and the number of parishes decreased, as active church practice by the faithful diminished as well. Sunday Mass attendance went down as well as baptisms and church weddings. Funerals held up better.[3] To complicate matters, many of these contemporary evolutions lay hidden under loaded terms such as de-traditionalization, postmodernity, individualization and secularization. What stands out in this language is not just that it is primarily sociological language, but that it is a language which can only be understood in the light of the past.

At present, Vatican II, with its initial plea for a church that would adapt to the needs of people and the contemporary world, seems far away. For some the handbrake must be strongly set to keep the church pure and free from societal influences. Doctrinal obedience is stressed, and compromises rejected. For others the same contemporary reality calls for renewal of the church, in its structures, governance, and focus. These questions, these tensions, when looking at the Catholic Church's evolution throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, are hardly new. Instead, the struggle between those longing for ecclesiastical *aggiornamento* and renewal and those anchored in self-protection and restoration seems age-old. It was already there under the pontificate of Pius IX.

---

[3] An inspiring analysis was given recently by Étienne Fouilloux in his 'Essai sur le devenir du catholicisme,' 526–57.

1.1. *John Paul I Succeeds Paul VI*

When Pope Paul VI died after a pontificate of fifteen years, he was succeeded by Albino Luciani, the third Cardinal Patriarch of Venice in the twentieth century, to be elected pope. Luciani took the name John Paul I, combining the names of his two predecessors.[4] His election on August 26, 1978 came as a surprise. He had been neither a renowned theologian nor a philosopher, neither a visionary nor a great operator. His strength lay in his down-to-earth pastoral sense and in his sense of humor and modesty, all considered assets for people inside as well as outside the church. In the international press he soon became known as the "smiling pope" and the "smile of God."[5] He was the first pope to write a book in which he wrote letters to illustrious historic and literary men and women: to Charles Dickens, Pinocchio, Therese of Lisieux, and others.[6] John Paul's critics contrasted these writings to the more sophisticated intellectual discourses of Popes Pius XII and Paul VI. He presented, in fact, a new image of the papacy, which did not cling to the old monarchical model; and it departed as well from the aura of exhilaration that had initially surrounded the Vatican II popes. Some find it difficult to define the type of pope John Paul I represented, unless one describes the kind he did not represent. Immediately after the 1978 papal election, the first thing well-informed Catholic observers noted was who, among the *papabili* proclaimed and analyzed in the media, had not been elected: neither an intransigent figure like the "pope who was never elected," Cardinal Siri of Genoa,[7] nor a more practically realist figure like Cardinal Giovanni Benelli of Florence.

Aside from the name choice, it is clear that Luciani's pontificate would have been marked by the complex heritage of the council, at a time when new challenges were faced in the governance of the Catholic Church.[8] The very issue of how to handle the conciliar heritage had already been very much present during the conclave itself. All of the Cardinals permitted

---

[4] Pope John Paul I was the first pope to abandon the papal coronation; and he was the first pope to choose a double name for his papal name. His legacy was so remarkable that his successor, Cardinal Karol Wojtyla, chose the same name.

[5] In 2006, the Italian Public Broadcasting Service, RAI, produced a television miniseries about the life of John Paul I, under the header *'Papa Luciani: Il sorriso di Dio'* (literally, "Pope Luciani: God's smile").

[6] See the edition of these letters in *Illustrissimi: The Letters of John Paul I* (London, 1979).

[7] Benny Lai, *Il papa non eletto: Giuseppe Siri Cardinale di Santa Romana Chiesa* (Rome, 1993).

[8] Cf. Andrea Lazzarini, *Jean Paul I: Le pape d'un nouveau matin* (Paris, 1979).

to vote had received a *Memoir* drafted by members of the Bologna *Istituto per le scienze religiose*, influenced by Giuseppe Dossetti and Giuseppe Alberigo. The *Memoir* stressed the need to implement the *aggiornamento* called for by John XXIII.[9] In this sense, some issues from the pontificate of Pope Paul VI would be high on the agenda: the implementation of synodality, the evolution of liberation theology, and the difficult relationship between the pope and the Society of Jesus.[10] Increasingly, notwithstanding Montini's policies, matters such as the priesthood, celibacy, and sexual morality had come under pressure. Other problematic areas were liturgy, ecumenism,[11] and the (limits to) freedom of theology and theologians. Here too, the new pope would be forced to take a position; and the extent to which he would allow for subsidiary-based decision-making remained an open question.

The historian's task, of course, is not that of "educated guessing." Ultimately, no matter how tempting, little more can be said about this pontificate than the brief sketch already available. Pope John Paul I's pontificate lasted merely 33 days. The pope had an affable appearance; and his death remains somewhat mysterious, since it was awkwardly handled by people within the Vatican. Inconsistent Vatican statements made following the pope's death led to a number of conspiracy theories. These Vatican statements concern who found the pope's body, the time when he was found dead, and what papers were in his hands, etc. David Yallop published his conspiracy theory in 1984 with his book *In God's Name.*[12]

---

[9] See Giovanni Miccoli, *Le pontificat de Jean Paul II: Un gouvernement contrasté* (Brussels, 2012).

[10] On this matter, and the plans made by Luciani to intervene and to act against Pedro Arrupe and the general direction taken by the Society of Jesus, see Miccoli, *Le pontificat de Jean-Paul II*, p. 118. During the pontificates of Paul VI, John Paul I, and John Paul II, the key figure for Catholicism's commitment to ecumenical dialogue and dialogue with the Jews would be Cardinal Willebrands, who succeeded Cardinal Bea as the head of the Secretariat for Christian Unity in 1969. See *The Ecumenical Legacy of Cardinal Willebrands, 1909–2006*, ed. Adelbert Denaux and Peter De Mey [BETL 253] (Louvain, 2012).

[11] For the brief engagement of John Paul I in ecumenical matters, see the document collection *Doing the Truth in Charity: Statements of Pope Paul VI, Popes John Paul I, John Paul II, and the Secretariat for Christian Unity, 1964–1980*, ed. Thomas F. Stransky and John B. Sheerin [Ecumenical Documents 1] (New York, 1982).

[12] David Yallop, *In God's Name: An Investigation into the Murder of Pope John Paul* (New York, 1984). Many others offered blunt theories. Shortly after Yallop's book came Robert Hutchinson's *Their Kingdom Come: Inside the Secret World of Opus Dei* (New York, 1997). Hutchinson believed that several high-placed ecclesiastics, who opposed to *Opus Dei* and ostensibly died of heart attacks, may in fact have been poisoned. Drawing on Yallop's thesis, Hutchinson suggested that this happened to Pope John Paul I. In the same category, see John Cornwell, *A Thief in the Night* (New York, 1989).

Setting aside the conspiracy theories, we restrict ourselves to simply stating that, as a matter of fact, John Paul I died suddenly on 28 September 1978. *Time Magazine* had called him the "September Pope."[13] His death brought for the second time, in just a few weeks, a wave of grief and mourning in Rome and throught the world. Again the cardinals went to Rome to find a successor for the chair of Peter.

2. *Pope John Paul II*

2.1. *Evangelization as a Program*

On 16 October 1978, the 111 cardinals in conclave chose the Polish Cardinal Karol Wojtyla as pope. Two things were striking about this choice: first, this was the first time in centuries, since the pontificate of the Dutch Pope Adrian VI from 1522 to 1523, that a non-Italian had been elected pope; and second, the cardinals had chosen a bishop from behind the Iron Curtain, a fact that raised considerable interest in a world still experiencing the Cold War. Linked to the dynamics of his predecessors, the new pope opted to go through life as Pope John Paul II.

Perhaps less striking than the political act, was the fact that by electing the 58-year-old Wojtyla, the cardinals had chosen a healthy and energetic man who liked to ski and climb mountains. The new pope was also someone who, because of his amateur theatre acting, had a great sensitivity for image perception, communication, and the media. Once again, the world got a new vision of the papacy: a dapper man in his late fifties who traveled the world, keenly aware of his religious and political power and influence.

Pope John Paul II unmistakably left his mark on the late twentieth-century church and society. While in the second half of the 1990s his health weakened, he was not hidden away from the world. On the contrary, the former sportsman pope[14] gradually became a sick and suffering pope, an image that held on strongly even after his death on April 2, 2005, Easter Monday. After the 32–year reign of Pius IX, John Paul II had had the

[13] *Time* cover story, October 9, 1978.

[14] When, at age 58, John Paul II became pope in 1978, he was still an avid sportsman: exceptionally healthy and active, jogging in the Vatican gardens, weight training, swimming, and hiking in the mountains; and he was fond of football. The media contrasted John Paul's athleticism and trim figure to the poor health of popes John Paul I and Paul VI, the portliness of John XXIII, and Pope Pius XII's constant claims of ailments.

second longest pontificate in history: 26 years. In retrospect, his tenure can be summarized in some points, which show, at once, in various perspectives, how the church developed after Paul VI.

In the wake of Pope Paul VI's visions expressed precisely ten years after the closure of Vatican II, in his Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii nuntiandi*, John Paul II made it immediately clear that his main concern for the postconciliar Catholic Church was that of evangelization. This clearly indicates that the core of the new pope's agenda was already shaped at the time of the 1974 Synod of bishops—often described as the "Third World Synod"—which was devoted to the theme of evangelization. Nevertheless, deep tensions underlaid the *modus interpretandi* of this synodal theme and were of great concern to the man who would become pope in 1978. One of the key players, and the relator at the 1974 Synod was Cardinal Wojtyla. His role as the Synod's relator and the one responsible for a "conclusive document" for the Synod was a painful one.[15] Wojtyla failed to arrive at a closing statement,[16] and Paul VI's apostolic exhortation would end up as the real result. Nevertheless, for John Paul II passages such as the one found in *Evangelii nuntiandi* 78, would set the tone for his own program during his pontificate:

> We are the pastors of the faithful, and our pastoral service impels us to preserve, defend, and to communicate the truth regardless of the sacrifices that this involves. So many eminent and holy pastors have left us the example of this love of truth. In many cases it was an heroic love. The God of truth expects us to be the vigilant defenders and devoted preachers of truth.[17]

Although tying itself explicitly to the agenda of Vatican II, the Catholic magisterium smoothly returned to an emphasis on the "defense" of truth, as the dogmatic undercurrent for evangelization.[18] Careful observers of the postconciliar church have noted, in the early years of John Paul II's

---

[15] The then archbishop of Krakow reported on this episode himself in Karol Wojtyla, *En esprit et en vérité: Receuil de textes 1949–1978* (Paris, 1980), pp. 262–3.

[16] On Wojtyla's failure to reach a warranted consensus document, and on the reaction of French Cardinal Marty, see Christoph Theobald, 'Le style pastoral de Vatican II et sa réception postconciliaire: Élaboration d'une critériologie et quelques exemples significatifs,' in *Vatican II comme style: L'herméneutique théologique du Concile*, ed. Joseph Famerée [Unam sanctam: N.S. 4] (Paris, 2012), pp. 265–86, there 277–9.

[17] Paul VI, 'Evangelii nuntiandi (December 8, 1975),' *AAS* 68 (1976), 5–76.

[18] See George Weigel, *The End and the Beginning: Pope John Paul II, The Struggle for Freedom, the Last Years, the Legacy* (New York, 2010).

pontificate that precisely his papacy constituted a turnabout.[19] Moreover, the face of evangelization under John Paul II became increasingly tied to the personal role of the pope as the unifying center of Catholicism, unleashing a new brand of centralism along the papal path; and this path was, in very concrete terms, a long and meandering one. In his desire to meet people in the places where they live, and to reach out around the globe, Pope John Paul II made 104 foreign journeys and visited 129 countries. A charismatic pope, he consistently attracted large crowds wherever he went. While some of his trips (such as to the United States and the Holy Land) were to places previously visited by Pope Paul VI, many others were to countries that no pope had ever visited.[20]

In each of the countries he visited, John Paul called people to faith rooted in the Gospel. A striking feature, after the loss of strong Marian devotion in the decade following Vatican II, was his emphasis on the Virgin and Mother Mary as a great example for the faithful. Both in his personal prayer life and in the devotional life he presented to the universal church, Mary held a central role; and the praying of rosary was strongly promoted. All the while, however, he stressed as well the central importance of the Eucharist, which he celebrated in large assemblies on each of his visits. Liturgy and sacraments were greatly emphasized by this pope, an emphasis readily understood against the background of the growing decline in Sunday Mass participation by Catholics in Western Europe

---

[19] Jan Grootaers, *De Vatican II à Jean-Paul II: Le grand tournant de l'église catholique* (Paris, 1981).

[20] Nine visits to Poland; eight visits to France; seven visits to the United States; five visits to Mexico and Spain; four visits to Brazil, Portugal, and Switzerland; three visits to Austria, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic (including one visit to Czechoslovakia), Dominican Republic, Germany, Guatemala, Kenya, Malta, and Slovakia; two visits to Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Hungary, India, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Slovenia, South Korea, Uruguay, and Venezuela; one visit to Albania, Angola, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Curaçao (then part of the Netherlands Antilles), Denmark, East Timor (then part of Indonesia), Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Guam, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Palestinian territories, Panama, Paraguay, Puerto Rico, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, São Tomé and Príncipe, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syria, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

and North America and growing secularization in church and society. For growing numbers of people each year, the Christian faith seemed no longer important or necessary. The pope tirelessly emphasized, however, that the search for human meaning and spirituality was not extinct. Drawing on his own personal distress and evaluation of the negative scope of secularization in the West, he encouraged bishops to take up the mission of evangelization, and offered his life as an example. For Pope John Paul II, the "Holy Year" 2000 was an extra stimulus and response; and he had already outlined it in his November 1998 bull *Incarnationis mysterium*,[21] holding the official announcement of the Jubilee Year.

On several occasions, John Paul II used his status and role for political action on the international scene. Much of his pontificate's prestige is due to his role in the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the fall of the Berlin Wall, where the pope's voice played a major role in the political re-shaping of European and worldwide power balances. Coming from an Eastern European country, he understood the situation and the weaknesses of the communist regimes and was well informed. He added his personal weight to the cause of his countrymen—and many outside it—to bring about a change in regime. In Poland, to this day, John Paul remains a national hero. Outside Poland, too, the pope involved himself in politics and did not hesitate to put certain files on the discussion table with the heads of state who visited him or whom he visited. This political engagement is an explanation behind the fact that John Paul II, on May 13, 1981, was shot in Saint Peter's Square by the Turk Mehmet Ali Agca, whom the pope later visited in prison and forgave.

The evangelical mission of the pope became evident on another field as well: his attention and ministry to Catholic youth as a major element of evangelization. Pope Wojtyla knew better than anyone else that any discourse on the church's mission is void if young people cannot find their way to the church. Starting in 1986, the initiative of the World Youth Days was launched. They were to be organized every two years in an attempt to visit and encourage young people to walk in the footsteps of Jesus Christ. These massive events offered a reminder of pre-conciliar mass Catholicism, and met each time on a different continent, with the personal participation of John Paul. Young people reciprocated, and looked forward to seeing the pope.

---

[21] John Paul II, 'Incarnationis mysterium (November 29, 1998),' *AAS* 91 (1999), 129–43.

Another international initiative typical of the church after Pope Paul VI was the organization of the World Day of Prayer for Peace. Carrying out the legacy of *Nostra aetate*, leading representatives of different religions and philosophies met and shared peace overtures and advocacy for peace. The first World Day of Prayer was held on October 27, 1986, in Assisi.[22] No fixed pattern for regular meetings was set; but each time the World Day of Prayer took place on the initiative of the pope. This kind of personal engagement included the recognition from the side of the pope that, while "world peace is connected with the name of Christ," Christendom has not always contributed to peace and has created victims in the course of its own history.[23] The same acknowledgement was heard in the homily of the pope on March 12, 2000, when he has asked for forgiveness for the sins committed by the sons and daughters of the church, stressing the responsibility of Christians in the horrors of the Shoah and wrongs inflicted on Jewish people.[24] Other historical events underline the fact that this pontificate created a way of reaching out to other religious traditions that moved well beyond the hesitant attitude of previous Catholic leadership. Along the same lines, several other historic events still stand out, like the pope's visit to the El-Azhar University in Cairo and to the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem.

John Paul II held important meetings as well with leaders of the Anglican Church, the Eastern Orthodox Church, the Greek Orthodox Church, and so on. Inter-religious dialogue and ecumenism were central to his ministry. At the same time, however, it was precisely such engagements that challenged the understanding of primacy as well as the Catholic Church's self-understanding.

2.2. *Between Schism and Canonization*

The Roman Catholic postconciliar self-understanding as a church committed to dialogue with the religious other was continually attacked by

---

[22] For a study on the importance of the Assisi meeting, see Alberto Melloni, 'La rencontre d'Assise et ses développements dans la dynamique du Concile Vatican II,' in *Le christianisme vis-à-vis des religions*, ed. Joseph Doré (Namur and Paris, 1997), pp. 99–130.

[23] For the official report see the publication by the Pontifical Commission Iustitia et Pax, *Assisi journée mondiale de prière pour la paix* (Rome, 1987). From an intransigent perspective, Johannes Dörmann, *La théologie de Jean-Paul II et l'esprit d'Assise* (Versailles, 1995), offers a very critical and negative picture of the Assisi encounter.

[24] This was tied to the publication of both the document *Mysterium incarnationis*, and the ITC-document entitled *Memory and Reconciliation: the Church and the Faults of the Past*, both of the same year 2000.

the intransigent theologians around Archbishop Lefebvre, who, during the first years of John Paul II's pontificate, were still considered members of the Roman Catholic Church. The demands put forward by this dissident fraction posed serious threats to the reception of conciliar renewal.[25] This was especially the case with ecumenism and interreligious dialogue; but touched on how to celebrate the liturgy as well. In a larger sense, the dismissal of the Vatican II heritage in these circles harkened back to the age-old refusal to enter into conversation with modernity and the Post Enlightenment thought-world. Ultimately, the options taken by John Paul II proved irreconcilable with the demands of the group; and as a consequence of the ordination of four bishops by Archbishop Lefebvre, the pope declared, on July 2, 1988, that the Fraternity of Pius X was schismatic.

Two sides marked the coin for the Polish Pope: On one side, a major excommunication; and on the other, beatifications and canonizations. None of John Paul II's predecessors beatified or canonized so many people. He presided over more beatifications (1,338) and canonizations (482) than all previous popes combined. It is not surprising that John Paul II himself was beatified by his successor in 2011. The element of beatifications played a significant role, as well, in this pope's attitude toward to the Eastern European Catholic communities. A large proportion of beatified and canonized men and women came from these areas; and the pope sought to provide Eastern Catholics with models and role figures for their faith. Along the same lines, one can better appreciate his encyclical *Slavorum apostoli*,[26] tying his program of evangelization to the celebration of the Slavic apostles Saints Cyril and Methodius as co-patrons of Europe. While John Paul II's attention for the Slavic peoples was larger than that of any of his predecessors, his stress on beatifications and canonizations also displayed a strong emphasis on the role of martyrdom and suffering in and for the Catholic faith.

2.3. *The Pope as the Unifying Center*

Besides being a traveling pope, John Paul II was also a writing pope, who issued fourteen encyclicals, all characterized by a thorough knowledge of the subject and strong personal commitment. Yet in daily church reality,

---

[25] Paul Airiau, 'Des théologiens contre Vatican II 1965–2005,' in *Un nouvel âge de la théologie?*, ed. Dominique Avon and Michel Fourcade [Signes des temps] (Paris, 2009), pp. 69–84.

[26] John Paul II, 'Slavorum apostoli (June 2, 1985),' *AAS* 77 (1985), 779–813.

several of these encyclicals bumped up against the tensions between clear principled directives on the one hand and pastoral workability on the other. While none of his encyclicals could match the impact on society of either *Pacem in terris* or *Populorum progressio*, several of John Paul's encyclicals had a major impact on the internal affairs of the church. This revealed the tension rising between the outward prestige of this pontificate and an enduring internal crisis, in which John Paul II claimed his role as the focal point for Catholic theology, touching on several areas. One thinks in particular about his last six encyclicals: *Centesimus annus*[27] (social encyclical on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of *Rerum novarum*), *Veritatis splendor*[28] (on the foundations of Catholic morality), *Evangelium vitae*[29] (on the sanctity of life, from conception), *Ut unum sint*[30] (on ecumenism), *Fides et ratio*[31] (on the relationship between faith and reason), and *Ecclesia de eucharistia*[32] (about the essence of the Eucharist for the church).[33]

As the subjects of the aforementioned encyclicals demonstrate, Pope John Paul II, more than his predecessors, became known for his radical stance on ethical issues, particularly his opposition to abortion and euthanasia. Reasoning along the lines of *Humanae vitae*, he argued that abortion and euthanasia could in no case be permitted.[34] His rigid position was regularly contested, in international forums, by those arguing in favour of allowing abortion and euthanasia in exceptional situations. The governments of Belgium and the Netherlands encountered strongly negative Vatican reactions after their respective parliaments passed laws permitting abortion and euthanasia under certain circumstances.[35] For Pope John Paul II such laws promoted nothing less than a violation of the sanctity of life. The Low Countries also raised another difficult issue,

---

[27] John Paul II, 'Centesimus annus (May 1, 1991),' *AAS* 83 (1991), 793–867.
[28] John Paul II, 'Veritatis splendor (December 9, 1993),' *AAS* 85 (1993), 1133–228.
[29] John Paul II, 'Evangelium vitae (March 25, 1997),' *AAS* 87 (1995), 401–522.
[30] John Paul II, 'Ut unum sint (May 25, 1995),' *AAS* 87 (1995), 921–82.
[31] John Paul II, 'Fides et ratio (September 14, 1998),' *AAS* 91 (1999), 5–88.
[32] John Paul II, 'Ecclesia de eucharistia (April 17, 2003),' *AAS* 95 (2003), 433–75.
[33] For a broader introduction, see Richard A. Spinello, *The Encyclicals of John Paul II: An Introduction and Commentary* (Lanham, 2012).
[34] Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 'Declaration on Euthanasia,' *AAS* 72 (1980), 542–52.
[35] Abortion in Belgium was fully legalized on April 4, 1990. The Belgian government temporarily suspended King Baudouin I from power for one day, after he declared that he could not, in good conscience as a Roman Catholic, sign a new law permitting abortion. Abortion in the Netherlands had already been fully legalized on November 1, 1984. Euthanasia became legal in the Netherlands in April 2002 and in Belgium in September 2002.

which poses an ever widening challenge to the Catholic Church: the legalizing of same-sex marriage in civil law.

Along with heated debate on ethical issues, very fundamental discussion on the nature and structure of the church were ever imminent during this pontificate. A key theme in this debate was the relationship between the pope and the bishops. Pope John Paul II, during his long pontificate, appointed hundreds of bishops and named 231 cardinals in nine consistories. It is difficult to deny that there was a political strategy at play here as well. He demanded both a recognition that all new bishops and cardinals submit to the central administration of the church of Rome and that they persistently defend and proclaim the teachings of the church along lines laid out by the Curia. Theological boldness from cardinals and bishops was neither needed nor appreciated, and on several occasions this pontificate encountered clashes between Rome and influential men like Cardinals Walter Kasper and Carlo Maria Martini.[36]

Such clashes—one is also reminded of the tensions with French Bishop Jacques Gaillot under this pontiff[37]—reveal the high tense nature of a central debate running through the entire postconciliar period, i.e. the debate about the nature and place of primacy. The encyclical *Ut unum sint*, in which a clear and unequivocal commitment was expressed by the Catholic Church to promote Christian unity, certainly presented a landmark position in this debate. The encyclical went so far as inviting the other Christian denominations to join in a reflection regarding the nature of the ministry of the Bishop of Rome, described as a ministry of *episkopè*, "overseeing" in such a manner that "through the efforts of the Pastors, the true voice of Christ the Shepherd may be heard in all the particular

[36] Carlo Maria Martini, S.J., 1927–2012, was an Italian Jesuit and cardinal of the Catholic Church. He was archbishop of Milan from 1980 to 2002. Martini served as relator of the sixth General Assembly of the Synod of bishops in 1983, and later served as president of the European bishops's conference between 1987 and 1993. In 2000, he criticized *Dominus Iesus* for its insistence that the Catholic Church equals the sole true Church of Christ. More recently, only hours after the cardinal's death, the Italian daily *Corriere della Sera* (August 31, 2012), printed his final interview in which he described the Catholic Church as "200 years out of date", and explained: Our culture has aged, our churches are big and empty and the church bureaucracy rises up. The church must admit its mistakes and begin a radical change, starting from the pope and the bishops. The pedophilia scandals oblige us to take a journey of transformation.

[37] Bishop Jacques Gaillot was bishop of Évreux in France from 1982 to 1995. In the latter year, by a decision of Pope John Paul II, he was demoted to be titular bishop of Partenia, an extinct diocese, for having expressed too controversial and too heretodox positions on religious, political, and social matters. See Pierre Pierrard, *Jacques Gaillot* (Paris, 2002).

Churches."[38] This openness to re-think the nature of papal primacy triggered major and positive reactions from other Christian denominations;[39] yet on the internal Roman Catholic front the issue played out very differently. The Achilles' heel in the implementation of Vatican II ecclesiology still remained the issue of collegiality. Increasingly, the required relationship between sacramentality and collegiality posed difficulties. While as a council father, Bishop Wojtyla had been suspicious of the evolution of *Gaudium et spes*,[40] and in the ecclesiological debate had shown himself favoring a description of the church as a *societas perfecta*,[41] the relationship between primacy and world episcopate would turn out to be a weak point in his pontificate. One sees this in his way of dealing with the synods of bishops. The notion of synodality was filled in, in a highly restrictive manner.[42]

One the one hand, John Paul II organized more episcopal synods than his predecessors. Whereas Pope Paul VI called together six synods, held during the last decade of his pontificate, John Paul II's pontificate witnessed sixteen: six ordinary synods, two extraordinary and eight special synods. The latter category—the special synods—were, chronologically, the Synod for the Netherlands (1980), for Europe (1991), for Africa (1994), for Lebanon (1995), for America (1997), for Asia (1998) for Oceania (1998) and again for Europe (1999).

On the other hand John Paul's understanding of the role of the synods was quite different from that of his predecessor Paul VI. It should be readily acknowledged that the calling for continental synods throughout the second half of the John Paul II pontificate demonstrated an awareness of the needs and contextual challenges confronting particular and local churches, the sense of church became increasingly identified with the church's its central leadership; yet synods, under John Paul II—as of 1985 organized mainly under the leadership of Cardinal Jan Pieter Schotte, were more than often reduced to mere ratifications of Roman prepared

---

[38] John Paul II, 'Ut unum sint,' n. 94.

[39] Seven years after the encyclical appeared, the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity published an overview of the responses, in its *Information Service* 109/1–2 (2002), 29–42.

[40] Horacio Javier Antunez, *Karol Wojtyla y Gaudium et Spes: Historia de las intervenciones de Juan Pablo en la elaboración de la Constitución Pastoral* (Rome, 2005).

[41] Jan Grootaers, 'K. Wojtyla auf dem Zweiten Vatikanum,' in *Herder Korrespondenz* 33 (1979), 453–8.

[42] Jan Grootaers, *Heurs et malheurs de la collégialité: Pontificats et synodes face à la réception de Vatican II* [ANL 69] (Louvain, 2012).

statements.[43] The omnipresence of the travelling pope was also increasingly understood in terms of a lack of respect for local bishops and episcopal conferences governing their own territories. The same tension and a decreasing sense of subsidiarity in universal church government was felt with the promulgation, in 1983, of the new Code of Canon Law,[44] that was to be written and expanded in the spirit and light of Vatican II. Though this was a necessary legal step for all that church, church structure, and church functioning concerned, many theologians wondered to what extent the pastoral spirit of Vatican II had been rendered once more subordinate to a juridical model of the church, in which the notion of "communion" had been interpreted in terms of *hierarchical* communion.[45] Here too, the reception of a discussion that started under Paul VI proved crucial for the development of postconciliar Catholicism.

As far as ecclesiology and the stress on doctrinal truths is concerned, the publication of two documents proved particulary significant for the course of Catholicism under John Paul II. First, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*[46] appeared in 1992. The new Catechism, prepared by a commission led by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, who had succeeded Cardinal Franjo Seper as the head of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in 1981, was primarily intended as a guide and support for bishops. It was written in an easy style and its content was clear and unambiguous, especially when touching on ethical issues about the beginning and end of human life. It set the tone for the Vatican's dealings with theological and doctrinal plurality. While such plurality had still been endorsed by the International Theological Commission in its 1975[47] set of *Theses on*

---

43 See Alberto Melloni and Silvia Scatena, *Synod and Synodality* (Münster, 2005).

44 The 1983 *Code of Canon Law* is the codification of canonical legislation for the Catholic Church of the Latin. It was announced and promulgated on January 25, 1983 by Pope John Paul II's Apostolic Constitution 'Sacrae disciplinae leges,' *AAS* 75 (1983), VII–XIV. See *Codex iuris canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus, fontium annotatione et indice analytico-alphabetico* (Vatican City, 1989). The Eastern Catholic Churches follow the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, promulgated in 1990.

45 On this interpretation, see Bernd Jochen Hilberath, 'Communio hierarchica: Historischer Kompromiss oder hölzernes Eisen?,' *Theologische Quartalschrift* 177 (1997); pp. 202–19.

46 The decision to publish a catechism was taken at the Extraordinary Assembly of the Synod of bishops, convened by Pope John Paul II on January 25, 1985, commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the close of the Second Vatican Council. In 1986 Pope John Paul II established a commission composed of twelve bishops and cardinals, in charge of the project.

47 'Theses on the Relationship between the Ecclesiastical Magisterium and Theology,' with commentary by Otto Semmelroth and Karl Lehmann, in *International Theological Commission: Texts and Document 1969–1985* (San Francisco, 1989), 1:133–48.

the Relationship between the Ecclesiastical Magisterium and Theology, that relationship became ever more tense under Ratzinger and John Paul. In June 2000 it was severely mitigated by a second major document: *Dominus Iesus*.[48] This statement issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith concerned "the unity and salvific universality of Jesus Christ and the church." In it, the Congregation tacitly relied on an official Catholic position from before Vatican II in order to stress the impossibility of reaching salvation without Jesus Christ, and of salvation outside the Roman Catholic Church. More importantly the Vatican tended to stress the full identification between the Church of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church, a tendency taken further by Pope Benedict XVI in a 2007 Instruction of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, interpreting *Lumen gentium*'s article eight.[49]

Dominus Iesus demonstrated the solid imprint Cardinal Ratzinger had gained on the pontificate of Pope John Paul II. This was already becoming evident at the 1985 Synod dealing with the interpretation of Vatican II, and a fortiori of collegial governance.[50] Already in the mid 1980s, and immediately after the publication of the new Code of Canon Law, the ecclesiological reading of *Lumen gentium*'s much debated third chapter was carried out through the lense of the *Nota explicativa praevia* (see chapter five). As a result, the notion of *communio* was proposed (already in a document coming from the International Theological Commission and distributed among the bishops on the eve of the 1985 Synod)[51] as the

---

[48] Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 'Dominus Iesus (August 6, 2000),' *AAS* 92 (2000), 742–65.

[49] Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Responses to Some Questions Regarding Certain Aspects of the Nature of the Church* (July 29, 2007). This document, offering a restrictive interpretation of the meaning of the "subsistit-in" clause in *Lumen gentium* 8, has sparked a large debate among ecclesiologists. For a survey, see Karim Schelkens, 'Lumen gentium's "subsistit in" Revisited: The Catholic Church and Christian Unity After Vatican II,' *TS* 69 (2008), 875–93; and the landmark article by Francis A. Sullivan, The Meaning of "subsistit in" as Explained by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith,' *TS* 69 (2008), 395–409.

[50] Cf. Francesco Saverio Venuto, *La recezione del Concilio Vaticano II* (Cantalupa, 2011), pp. 53–107; Gilles Routhier, 'L'assemblée extraordinaire de 1985 du synode des évêques: Moment charnière de relecture de Vatican II dans l'église catholique,' in *Vatican II et la théologie: Perspectives pour le XXI siècle*, ed. Philippe Bordeyne and Laurent Villemin [Cogitatio fidei 254] (Paris, 2006), pp. 61–88. Also see the documentation of the Synod, where the Belgian Cardinal Danneels played an important role, in Synode extraordinaire Rome 1985, *Vingt ans après Vatican II* [Documents d'église] (Paris, 1986).

[51] Moreover, in the same period immediately preceding the Synod, the famous book containing the outcome of long interviews with Ratzinger, conducted by Vittorio Messori, came out. To some extent, the book was "received" by the Synod. See Joseph Cardinal

single and key concept for Catholic ecclesiology. Again, *communio* was clearly read in terms of "hierarchical communion," as became clear some years later, with the promulgation of the letter *Communionis notio* in 1992. All of this stretched out toward a limited reading of collegiality, limited in terms of affective collegiality.[52]

The role of Cardinal Ratzinger as a key player in the Roman Curia is undeniable today. Under his leadership a number of theological trends, thinkers, and publications have been charged of being inconsistent with the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. Such developments highlight the central role taken up by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in the postconciliar realm, illustrated by famous cases against theologians such as Edward Schillebeeckx, Jacques Dupuis, Hans Küng, Leonardo Boff, etc. This brings us to the place of Catholic theology today.

3. *Theology's Revised Topology*

Rooted in tendencies present at Vatican II, but perhaps even more in the scattered and pluralist evolution of the world after the 1968 revolutions and the implosion of great power blocks that came along with the tumbling of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the most recent decades in theology offer a picture of diversity and fragmentation.[53] While the last two decades of Christianity's second millennium present themselves as a rich period for Catholic theology, it is a complex undertaking for contemporary historians to discover the central evolutions, if at all the notion of "center" is warranted as a descriptive category.

Theological discourse under John Paul II can be split-up into numerous subdomains, many of them linked to the rise of methodological diversity in the field of academic theology. A multitude of contexts, discourses, and methods now shape the discipline; and it is perhaps too early to present

---

Ratzinger (and Vittorio Messori), *The Ratzinger Report: An Exclusive Interview on the State of the Church*, trans. Salvator Attanasio and Graham Harrison (San Francisco, 1985).

[52] See the *Final Report of the 1985 Extraordinary Synod* (Washington DC, 1986). With regard to affective collegiality, see the study of Peter De Mey, 'Is Affective Collegiality Sufficient? A Plea for a More Effective Collegiality of Bishops in the Roman Catholic Church and Its Ecumenical Implications,' in *Friendship as an Ecumenical Value*, ed. Antoine Arjakovsky and Marie-Aude Tardivo (Lviv, 2006), pp. 132–53.

[53] *Le devenir de la théologie catholique mondiale depuis Vatican II: 1965–1999*, ed. Joseph Doré [Sciences théologiques et religieuses] (Paris, 2000).

an adequate historical perspective with a clear description of content, development, significance, and impact. Nonetheless, we shall endeavor to carefully and cautiously sketch some lines along which the most recent evolutions can be read at this moment in history.

3.1. *Criticism and Fragmentation*

Undoubtedly, the contemporary Catholic theological landscape has been shaped by magisterial discourse coming from Vatican offices, yet it also bears the stamp of academic reflection. This is a first point that cannot be neglected: the topology of theology has changed tremendously. While the evolutions sketched in previous chapters offer a very Western image, and most breakthroughs in theology were in fact taking place in European and American milieus, theology has gone global. The geographical shift went hand in hand with a sociological change, as the face of those practicing the age-old "Sacred Discipline" has changed remarkably. After Vatican II one notes a sharp increase in the number of lay theologians in theological faculties and a gradual "feminization." To an ever decreasing extent religious study houses and diocesan seminaries have become the "topoi" of Catholic theology. In many places, the latter has moved to the purely academic environment of universities wordwide, where instruction and research on themes such as marriage and conjugal ethics slowly became the responsibility of lay people. Not only has the theological populace experienced the shift from "clerical" to "lay theology," it also struggles with the growing distance in time over against Vatican II. Increasingly, the generation of council participants—marked by (pre)conciliar ideological struggles—is disappearing as a post-Vatican II generation arises. Old questions have been answered and looked at with fresh eyes. New questions have been brought up. These changing perspectives, have pushed many classic domains of Catholic theology out of its old borders.

It has become increasingly difficult to speak of "one" Roman Catholic theology. The tree of "Roman theology" has grown many new and often fragile branches; and the connections between branches and tree are not always as clear and distinct as they used to be seen. Some things are beyond discussion. The end of the Thomist handbook tradition has arrived, and neo-scholastics no longer call the shots. No longer can we point to one or another handbook tradition that assumes the place of a "norm" over all other philosophical and theological perspectives. Self-focused and influenced by an emphasis on the theologian's proper *Sitz-im-Leben*, many theologians have taken the context in which they live as an

explicit starting point for their reflection, more than often with a reference to the heritage of Vatican II. The tension between the private and particular contexts in which theologies are being developed and the universal tradition offer a new impetus for study, sometimes creating nostalgic reactions and the fears about an overemphasis on particularity. Nevertheless, influential theologians have developed the quest for a contemporary reformulation of classic faith formulae further.

The thought of Karl Rahner has played a key role in the postconciliar realm, with his stress on the need to find ever new words to profess the Catholic faith, even warning for the risks of clinging to traditional propositions to strongly. According to Rahner, superficial repetition of the old formulae would result into mere "orthophony" rather than orthodoxy, with people professing the true faith only verbally. A similar need for rephrasing was stressed in the writings of theologians such as Schillebeeckx and Avery Dulles, who "went so far as to suggest that socio-pathological and ideological forces had been the source of certain formulae. Hidden agendas of emperors and princes of the church were the reason why certain formulations had been adopted rather than others. They mentioned all of this in order to prove the relativity of the form ('words') that had been given to the experience of 'the absolute mystery which came to us in grace'."[54] In this type of theology, the heritage of Post Enlightenment philosophy and the integration of historical reasoning in theology can be felt deeply.

Yet, fear for relativism arose, and looking generally at post Vatican II theology, wherever theological reflection became too bold in the eyes of the highest church leadership, its practitioners were sentenced. One thinks, for instance, of the files opened in Rome against Edward Schillebeeckx, Piet Schoonenberg, Leonardo Boff, Jacques Dupuis, and several others. Although the Index of Prohibited Books was abolished in 1966, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith reassumed its place as the Vatican's doctrinal watchdog, sometimes curtailing theological freedom.[55] Examples of this evolution are multiple: in 1989 the CDF issued a new formula for the Profession of Faith and the Oath of Fidelity.[56] Soon followed an

[54] Cf. Van Geest, *The Incomprehensibility of God*, p. 185. Also see Avery Dulles' *The Survival of Dogma* (New York, 1971), pp. 95–203.

[55] On this development, see *The Vision of John Paul II: Assessing His Thought and Influence*, ed. Gerard Mannion (Collegeville MN, 2008), pp. 78–106.

[56] Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 'Profession of Faith and Oath of Fidelity (January 9, 1989),' *AAS* 81 (1989), pp. 104–6.

instruction on the ecclesial vocation of the theologian,[57] which literally stated that the theologian must not endanger the church's teaching; and that the freedom of the theologian exists within boundaries established by that church's central government. Ultimately restricting the role of Catholic theologians this was stressed once again and even anchored in Latin as well as Eastern Canon Law by John Paul II's 1998 motu proprio *Ad tuendam fidem*.[58] In other words, postmodern Catholic theology must by all means remain *Roman* Catholic theology . . .

3.2. *Theology and Theologies*

After describing the *topology* of theology today, and having it portrayed as a fragmented discipline with various theological currents and undercurrents, the next and final step is to present contemporary Catholic theology in three general groupings, distinguishing between separate types of contemporary theology. These theological *typoi* can be listed as: (1) contextual theologies, (2) thematic theologies, and (3) ecumenical and interfaith theologies. We will discuss each of these three, albeit with an important preliminary observation that, most often, the contemporary practice of theology is a combination of several of the three and sometimes all three.

Contextual Theologies—The emphasis in academic circles on the context, has led to the so-called "contextual theologies." One speaks today, for instance, about African theology, Latin American theology, South Asian, and European theology, which resonates with and maintains close ties with the North American theology of Canada and the USA. Thus theology is "tied" to a region or a whole continent. Despite the flourishing of Catholic theology elsewhere in the world, European and North American theology remains the dominant Western theology worldwide.

The central points in the practice of theology differ from continent to continent. In South-East Asia, Africa and Latin America, there is increased focus on politics, poverty, nature and creation, and meeting with other Christian denominations and non-Christian philosophies. That is not absent in North American and European theology, but there the focus lies more on systematic theology and ethics. Contextual theology is often

[57] Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 'Donum veritatis (May 24, 1990),' *AAS* 82 (1990), 1550–70.

[58] John Paul II, 'Ad tuendam fidem (May 18, 1998),' *AAS* 90 (1998), 457–61.

rooted in and interspersed with philosophical methods and insights that are contextually loaded. One ought to consider the example of the work of the French philosopher-theologian Jean-Luc Marion, a pupil of Jacques Derrida, whose book *God Without Being*[59] is concerned predominantly with an analysis of idolatry, a theme strongly linked in Marion's work with love and the gift, which is a concept also explored at length by Derrida. Parallel to the development of contextual theology—but separate from it—the highest church leadership has developed a process of thought that is equally continental oriented. We touched on this in the discussion about episcopal synods.

Thematic Theologies—Besides a territorial focus for theology, there is also the particular focus of different groups and themes, as evidenced by the growth and flowering of liberation theology, black theology, ecological theology, and gender theology (whose feminist theology is both the precursor and still the central branch). It goes without saying that the specificity of the target groups and themes exists in close connection with any territorial context, as shown by our survey.

(1) Liberation Theology: As indicated in the previous chapter, the soil of liberation theology is the situation of poverty and human enslavement in the countries of Latin America. Motivated by Gospel values, several theologians—especially clergy—have been at the forefront of protecting the poor and fighting against poverty. They were strongly stimulated and influenced by the commitment of the Latin American bishops, as formulated during their meeting in Medellín, in response to their "looking back and looking forward" based on the decisions of Vatican II. In 1979, in Puebla, the same line of thought continued to be developed by Latin American bishops, but would undergo increasing pressure from the side of the Vatican.

Four Roman Catholic thinkers have greatly shaped (Latin American) liberation theology, Gustavo Gutiérrez, Leonardo Boff, Jon Sobrino, and Juan Luis Segundo. It is however to be noted that liberation theology has not been confined just to South America. Nor has it been just a Roman Catholic project. One cannot ignore the importance of the Argentine theologian, José Miguez Bonino, who is a Methodist. Gustavo Gutiérrez comes from Peru, studied in the capital Lima, and in Lyon, France. He

[59] Jean-Luc Marion, *God Without Being* (Chicago, 1991).

has taught at the Catholic University of Peru and at Notre Dame University in the USA. He is the principal founder of liberation theology with his work *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation*[60] of 1971. In Lima, in 1974, he founded the Bartolome de las Casas Institute which he wrote about in his 1993 the book *Las Casas: In Search of the arms of Jesus Christ*.[61] In 2004 he joined the Dominican order. Together with Gutiérrez, the Brazilian philosopher and theologian Leonardo Boff is seen as well as founder of liberation theology. He received his doctorate in 1970 in Munich, where Joseph Ratzinger was one of the promoters. As a priest he campaigned strongly for human rights, especially for the poor and oppressed. To quench their thirst for righteousness, he not only worked with them but published many books as well. One of his books, *Church, Charism and Power*,[62] written in 1985, led the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, headed then by Joseph Ratzinger, to impose a gag order on him. In 1992, threatened once again by the Congregation, he left the priesthood and the Franciscan order. From 1993 he taught ethics in Rio de Janeiro. Jon Sobrino, born in Spain, studied in the USA and in Germany before returning to the first country where he had been sent as a Jesuit, El Salvador. In 1990 came the book *Mysterium Liberationis*, written by Sobrino and his, a year earlier murdered, fellow Jesuit Ignacio Ellacuría. It was greeted as a standard work on liberation theology but generated opposition from Rome. In 2007, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued a notification that there were aspects of Sobrino's work that were inconsistent with Catholic teaching and that reading the book is dangerous for the faithful. Like Sobrino, Juan Luis Segundo, was a member of the Society of Jesus. He studied theology in Argentina and Belgium (where he encountered Gutiérrez) and received a PhD in literature from the Sorbonne in Paris. After teaching in various places in the first part of the 1970s, Segundo became a strong proponent of Latin American liberation theology. Among his most important works is *A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity*.[63] When the Congregation for the Doctrine

[60] Gustavo Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation* (*Teología de la liberación: perspectivas*, 1971) trans. Sister Caridad Inda and ed. John Eaglson (Maryknoll, 1988).

[61] Gustavo Gutiérrez, *Las Casas: In Search of the Poor of Jesus Christ* (*En busca de los pobres de Jesucristo*, 1992), Trans. Robert R. Barr. (Maryknoll, 1993).

[62] Leonardo Boff, *Church, Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church* (New York, 1985).

[63] Juan Luis Segundo, *A Theology for Artisans of a New Humanity* (5 Vols., Buenos Aires, 1973–4) (Original title *Teología abierta para el laico adulto*).

of the Faith issued a statement in 1984 about some aspects of liberation theology, Segundo responded in 1985, after which the Congregation gave in a bit about liberation theology. Nevertheless the notification regarding Sobrino's work showed it still very vulnerable.

Considering liberation theology in Europe, one cannot neglect the German theologian Dorothee Sölle,[64] who died in 2003, four years after the publication of her memoirs *Against the Wind: Memoir of a Radical Christian*.[65] Her most famous book, was *Suffering*,[66] published in 1975. Here the image of God Almighty was set aside in favor of an image of a co-suffering God, who stands on the side of all humans in their struggle against all isms and stigmas: strong in the struggle for human liberation in an oppressive world and under an oppressive image of God. The trauma of the Holocaust, which clings to her fatherland's national history, has strongly influenced her thinking, just as, for example, the thought of Johann Baptist Metz and his political theology.

(2) Black Theology—Black theology[67] refers to a variety of theologies, which have at their base the liberation of the marginalized, especially Blacks in American and African contexts. Black theology mixes liberation theology with the civil rights and various Black Power movements. And it is, however, not restricted to just the USA and South Africa. Black theologies were popularized in the early 1970s in South Africa by Basil Moore, a Methodist theologian, and became particularly influential in South Africa and Namibia in motivating resistance to *apartheid*. Other Southern African black theologians include Barney Pityana, Allan Boesak, Itumeleng Mosala and Zephania Kameeta. In the United Kingdom, Dr. Robert Beckford, raised in the Pentecostal Church and currently a reader in theology at Canterbury Christ Church University, is a prominent black theology practitioner.

In the United States, three people stand out particularly: James H. Cone, who grew up in the African Methodist Church and is currently a professor at Union Theological Seminary in New York; Dwight N. Hopkins, an ardent member of the Trinity United Church of Christ, and currently a professor at the University of Chicago Divinity School; and Cornel West, currently a professor of African American Studies at Princeton and

---

[64] *The Theology of Dorothee Soelle*, ed. Sarah K. Pinnock (Harrisburg, 2003).

[65] Dorothee Sölle, *Against the Wind: Memoir of a Radical Christian* (Minneapolis, 1999).

[66] Dorothee Sölle, *Suffering* (London, 1975).

[67] James Deotis Roberts, *Liberation and Reconciliation: A Black Theology* (Louisville, 2005).

of Religious Philosophy and Christian Studies at the Union Theological Seminary in New York. One of the leading US Roman Catholic Black theologians is Bryan Massingale, who currently teaches at Marquette University. Massingale authored the book *Racial Justice and the Catholic Church*,[68] and conducts research exploring the contribution of Black religious radicalism to Catholic theology; the notion of "cultural sin" and its challenge to Catholic theological ethics; and the intersections of race and sexuality in both social life and Catholicism.

(3) Ecological Theology—Along with the increasing attention, in the international forum, for the environment and the climate, theology has seen a "greening," both in Roman Catholic theology and outside. One should consider, for example, the work of Sallie McFague and particularly her book *A New Climate for Theology: God, the World, and Global Warming*.[69] This development is anchored in reflections about human creation and the creation of the world and the relationship between the two. In the 1960s and 1970s a number of prominent Catholic thinkers stressed the "green" theme here. One thinks as well of the influence of the aforementioned Reformed theologian Jürgen Moltmann[70] and his *Theology of Hope*[71] and *God in Creation*[72] with its ecological doctrine of creation.

Considering contemporary ecological thinkers in Catholic theology, the Benedictine Brazilian Marcelo Barros de Sousa, author of *Heaven and Earth Marry*, cannot be left unmentioned. In the decade that followed Vatican II, he was the right hand of Dom Helder Camara, whom he had immersed in the philosophy and objectives of the Latin American liberation theology.[73] In 2008 he published published *Teologia pluralista libertadora intercontinental*,[74] a sequel to *Teologia latino-americana pluralista da libertaçao*.[75] In *Heaven and Earth Marry*, Barros develops the idea of

---

[68] Bryan Massingale, *Racial Justice and the Catholic Church* (Maryknoll, 2010).

[69] Sallie McFague, *A New Climate for Theology: God, the World, and Global Warming* (Minneapolis, 2008).

[70] Cf. Steven Bouma-Prediger, *The Greening of Theology: The Ecological Models of Rosemary Radford Ruether, Joseph Sittler, and Jürgen Moltmann* (Atlanta, 1995).

[71] Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*.

[72] Jürgen Moltmann, *God in Creation* (London, 1985). First published as: *Gott in der Schöpfung: Ökologische Schöpfungslehre* (Munich, 1985).

[73] On Helder Camara, de Sousa wrote the book *Dom Helder Camara: Profeta para os dias nossos* (Sao Paulo, 2008).

[74] Marcelo Barros de Sousa, *Teologia pluralista libertadora intercontinental* (Sao Paulo, 2008).

[75] Marcelo Barros de Sousa, *Teologia latino-americana pluralista da libertaçao* (Sao Paulo, 2008).

"ecojustice," indicating how sustainable agriculture and social justice can be reconciled from a theological perspective.

(4) Gender Theology—Since the breakthrough of feminist discourse in the 1970s, the theological theme of the relationship between husband and wife took on renewed importance. Feminist theology, especially, grew and prospered. Initially issues such as the ordination of women were on the top of the agenda. However, Pope John Paul II closed a door on the ordination of women with the letter *Ordinatio sacerdotalis*,[76] and made no opening for a married priesthood—thus following the line of conduct set out by Paul VI. In recent decades, this fraction of theological discourse has widened its scope, under the guidance of influential authors, such as Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza.

A native Hungarian, Schüssler Fiorenza received theological training in Germany and made a career in the USA as a feminist theologian. Her major international breakthrough came with her book *In Memory of Her*.[77] A year after the book appeared, she figured among the ninety-seven theologians—Catholics and others, including for example Rosemary Radford Ruether author to *Sexism and God-Talk*,[78]—signing a Catholic Statement on Pluralism and Abortion. This statement called for the recognition within the church of religious pluralism and called for a reconsideration of rigid anti-abortion standpoints in Catholicism.

In Schüssler Fiorenza's writings, the Bible plays a central role, as is abundantly apparent in her 1998 book *Sharing Her Word*.[79] Other important works in the field of feminist theology are undoubtedly Dorothee Sölle's *The Strength of the Weak*;[80] and the influential volume *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language*[81] by the Episcopalian Sallie McFague. Finally, feminist theology has grown in areas outside Europe and the USA. Feminist theology has grown for instance in Korea under the

---

[76] John Paul II, 'Ordinatio sacerdotalis (May 22, 1994),' *AAS* 86 (1994), 545–8.

[77] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (London, 1983).

[78] Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Sexism and God-Talk: Towards a Feminist Theology* (Boston, 1993).

[79] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Sharing Her Word: Feminist Biblical Interpretation in Context* (Boston, 1998). The book succeeded the volume entitled *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation* (Boston, 1992).

[80] Dorothee Sölle, *The Strength of the Weak: Toward a Christian Feminist Identity* (Westminster, 1985).

[81] Sallie McFague, *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language* (Minneapolis, 1982).

influence of the Korean Chung Hyung Kyung, who in 1990 wrote *Struggle to be the Sun Again: Introducing Asian Women's Theology.*[82]

Ecumenical and Interfaith Theologies—Next to contextual theology and theology addressing specific target groups or domains, ecumenical theology and interfaith theology have developed tremendously since 1980. Connected with faith in Jesus Christ, the reality of a globalizing world, multicultural and multi-religious, has increasingly attracted a number of theologians, and has been picked up by the Pontifical Council for Christian Unity as one of the curial offices most open to renewal and dialogue. The domain is wide and many French speaking theologians such as George Tavard, Hervé Legrand, Bernard Sesboüé, Emmanuel Lanne, and Jean-Marie Tillard have played a prominent role, as well as others like Wolfgang Beinert and Walter Kasper, insisting on the importance of spiritual ecumenism.[83]

In the broader field of the theology of religions, one thinks of Catholic theologians like David Tracy, Hans Küng, Paul Knitter, and Gavin D'Costa. In 1986 the Swiss theologian Hans Küng, as a former colleague of Joseph Ratzinger, published his book *Christianity and the World Religions.*[84] He explains the paradigm shift to "to an ecumenical theology of the postmodern era." On the first inside page of his monumental work *Das Christentum*[85] he sketches this shift in the series of major paradigm changes in the history of Catholic theology. Küng speaks to the multitude of Christian denominations and non-Christian religions and philosophies and appeals for a spirit of dialogue. Such dialogue is, according to him, the starting point for peace within and among nations and peoples worldwide. In the early 1990s, Küng initiated a project called *Weltethos* (Global Ethics), which is an attempt at describing what the world's religions have in common, rather than what separates them, and a drawing up of a minimal code of rules of behavior that everyone can accept. More than two decades later,

---

[82] Chung Hyung Kyung, *Struggle to be the Sun Again: Introducing Asian Women's Theology* (Maryknoll, 1990).

[83] For a good introduction, see *Celebrating a Century of Ecumenism*, ed. John A. Radano (Grand Rapids MI, 2012).

[84] Hans Küng, *Christianity and the World Religions: Paths of Dialogue with Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism* (New York, 1986). First published as: *Christentum und Weltreligionen: Hinführung zum Dialog mit Islam, Hinduismus und Buddhismus* (Munich, 1984).

[85] Hans Küng, *Das Christentum: Wesen und Geschichte* (Munich, 1994). Published in English translation as *Christianity: Its Essence and History* (London, 1994).

this foundation can look back on a rich record of research, lectures, publications, and contacts.

Because of his importance in the debate, we also mention the Protestant thinker John Hick, who stirred the reflection on religious pluralism. Hick, a British philosopher, who died in 2012, believed that all religions lead to the same God and so to salvation for all who believe in God. He is best known for his advocacy of religious pluralism, which is radically different from traditional Christian teaching. He noted in articles such as 'A Pluralist View'[86] that, as he came to know people who belonged to non-Christian faiths, he saw in them the same values he recognized in fellow Christians. This observation led him to begin questioning how a completely loving God could possibly sentence non-Christians who clearly espouse values that are revered in Christianity to an eternity in hell. Philosophically speaking, Hick is influenced by Kantian thought, when dealing with our perception of the Real (an expression used to define transcending reality), that the knowledge of God in separate religious traditions is always limited to these components of the Real that can appear within human experience embedded in each respective tradition. Any truth claim made by a tradition is in fact no more than a claim regarding a limited perception of God.

Hick has notably been criticized by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, who had examined the works of several theologians accused of relativism, such as Jacques Dupuis and Roger Haight. In Ratzinger's opinion many, if not all, were philosophically inspired by Hick, and the declaration *Dominus Iesus* was seen by many at the time as a condemnation of Hick's pluralist ideas and theories. Taking into account the Kantian background of Hick's attacks on religious exclusivism, *Dominus Jesus* may also be read as an exponent of Catholicism's ongoing difficulty to cope with the Enlightenment tradition, which in previous stages had led to condemnations of Hermes and Günther. In this line of thought other prominent Roman Catholic theologians are worth mentioning. Paul Knitter, for instance, the Paul Tillich Professor of Theology, World Religions and Culture at Union Theological Seminary in New York. Since publishing his acclaimed book, *No Other Name?*,[87] Knitter has been widely known for his religious pluralism, and

[86] John Hick, 'A Pluralist View,' in *More Than One Way: Four Views on Salvation in a Pluralistic World*, ed. Dennis R. Okholm and Thimoty R. Phillips (Grand Rapids MI, 1995), pp. 27–59.

[87] Paul Knitter, *No other name? A Critical Survey of Christian Attitudes Toward the World Religions* (Maryknoll, 1985).

has attracted the same criticism as his personal friend John Hick, from the then Cardinal Ratzinger.

Other prominent Roman Catholic voices are those of Gavin D'Costa and David Tracy. Tracy was first a professor at the Catholic University of America in Washington DC, where he was one of several theologians who objected to *Humanae vitae.* In 1985 he became professor at the University of Chicago Divinity School, until his retirement in 2006. The tension between "Christian theology and the culture of pluralism" is the leitmotiv of his oeuvre *The Analogical Imagination.*[88] Such tension is also the object of study by Gavin D'Costa, who in 1968 moved to Britain, arriving from his native Kenya. Opposing John Hick, whom he criticized in his 1987 doctoral dissertation *John Hick's Theology of Religions*, D'Costa positions himself in line with Karl Rahner's inclusive model of interreligious dialogue: God loves all people, but Christ's grace is necessary to achieve salvation. D'Costa's important works include *Theology and Religious Pluralism,*[89] *The Meeting of Religions and the Trinity,*[90] and *Christianity and the World Religions*.[91]

With the hot topic of theological and religious pluralism, we have reached the final words of this survey of two centuries of Catholicism. At this juncture, the time has come to look at the challenges of the pontificate of Benedict XVI with fresh eyes.

4. *Benedict XVI: The Papacy in the Internet-Age*

Over the past two centuries, Roman Catholicism has witnessed the ongoing challenge of both defining and re-defining its own ecclesial character, and of defining and re-defining its dogmatic tradition, the core of its faith, in a language and discourse of Post Enlightenment thought. This has been, and remains a constant struggle, which has not been neglected by the former Pope Benedict XVI. Only very recently, after nearly eight years of rule, Joseph Ratzinger's pontificate has come to a close, with an historic announcement on February 11, 2013. During the consistory held on that day, the pope read out the following message:

---

[88] David Tracy, *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism* (London, 1981).

[89] Gavin D'Costa, *Theology and Religious Pluralism* (Oxford, 1986).

[90] Gavin D'Costa, *The Meeting of Religions and the Trinity* (Edinburgh, 2000).

[91] Gavin D'Costa, *Christianity and the World Religions: Disputed Questions in the Theology of Religions* (Malden, 2009).

> After having repeatedly examined my conscience before God, I have come to the certainty that my strengths, due to an advanced age, are no longer suited to an adequate exercise of the Petrine ministry. I am well aware that this ministry, due to its essential spiritual nature, must be carried out not only with words and deeds, but no less with prayer and suffering. However, in today's world, subject to so many rapid changes and shaken by questions of deep relevance for the life of faith, in order to govern the barque of Saint Peter and proclaim the Gospel, both strength of mind and body are necessary, strength which in the last few months, has deteriorated in me to the extent that I have had to recognize my incapacity to adequately fulfill the ministry entrusted to me. For this reason, and well aware of the seriousness of this act, with full freedom I declare that I renounce the ministry of Bishop of Rome, Successor of Saint Peter, entrusted to me by the Cardinals on 19 April 2005, in such a way, that as from 28 February 2013, at 20:00 hours, the See of Rome, the See of Saint Peter, will be vacant and a Conclave to elect the new Supreme Pontiff will have to be convoked.

For the first time since the early fifteenth century, a Roman Pontiff has renounced his office, asking pardon for his personal defects, and underlining the fact that the Petrine office today requires not merely intellectual and spiritual depth, but also physical strength. The decision of Benedict XVI has received wide media coverage, all the more since for the first time in the two centuries surveyed in this monograph, a conclave was held while the previous person occupying the chair of Saint Peter was still alive.

On March 13, 2013, Cardinal Jorge Mario Bergoglio was elected pope, and chose the name of Francis. New challenges are ahead. At the present time, it remains impossible to conjecture as to the way in which the new pope will take up the complex heritage he finds. As a matter of fact, one can safely state that these two major axes of contemporary Catholicism, also run through the career and writings of the previous pope as a "tema con variazioni."

In the recently closed pontificate, the heritage of the last ecumenical council has played a prominent role. The last pope who has actively taken part in Vatican II,[92] Benedict XVI has continued the tradition of no less than four predecessors to speak out on this council's legacy, on its implementation, reception, and interpretation.[93] A former council

---

[92] On Ratzinger's role at the council, see Jared Wicks, 'Six Texts by Prof. Joseph Ratzinger as p*eritus* before and during Vatican Council II,' *Gregorianum* 89 (2008), 233–311; also see the document collection published as *The Ratzinger Reader: Mapping a Theological Journey*, ed. Lieven Boeve and Gerard Mannion (New York, 2010).

[93] An often neglected, but very interesting statement in this sense, was published by Ratzinger in his "Geleitwort" to the book of Thomas Weiler, *Volk Gottes—Leib Christi:*

peritus, Joseph Ratzinger has even devoted the last year of his reign, the Year of the Faith, to the commemoration of Vatican II and to promoting the new evangelization. In this sense, he is truly the heir of John Paul II. But the times had changed, and this pope was addressing and re-evangelizing a generation of Catholics for most of whom Vatican II, with its particular struggles and debates, belong to a distinct past.

The pontificate of Benedict XVI was also the first to fully have played in the third millennium; and along with it came a context different from what any previous pope had experienced. Benedict XVI was the first Roman Pontiff to be fully engaged in the internet era, the era of Facebook and Twitter,[94] of influential bloggers (in the Roman Catholic world, inevitably, the name of Sandro Magister rings a bell), and many other means of social communication. This novelty brought along its own pressing challenges and hardships, and raises sharp and previously unknown questions for the very functioning of the Holy See: How to (re-)evangelize in a media-centric society, characterized by rapid and massive communication? How to bring an age-old message to an age that is shaped by an explosion of opinions, facing the scattering of meaning? And how to exercise universal and central governance in a postmodern, eclectic, and pluralist world? An age where every word from the pope is spread and treated by the media—and often also by theologians—as if an encyclical would have the same weight and doctrinal value as the pope's weekly public audiences, brings along its own complexities for worldwide government as for local church life. It even creates a new brand of tensions between the local and the universal, as it challenges our notion of the relationships between center and periphery. Less than ever before, there is a distance in space and time to be bridged and the pope's words enter the local churches immediately. This features a new, postmodern brand of mediatized centralism, yet it also brings along tensions within the heart of local communities.

Die ekklesiologie Joseph Ratzingers und ihr Einfluss aud das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil, Aspekte eines Zusammenhangs (Mainz, 1997), p. xiii, where the then Cardinal stressed: wie vielschichtig der Werdegang der Konzilstexte gewesen ist. Der Einsatz vieler einzelner auf den verschiedensten Ebenen gehörte dazu. In solchem Zusammenwirken reifte eine Aussage, in der das Ganze wesentlich mehr ist als die einzelnen Teile und das Besondere jedes einzelnen eingesenkt ist in eine ihn überschreitende Dynamik des Ganzen, die auch sein Eigenes verwandelt und in eine nicht von ihm kommende Synthese hineingeformt hat.

94 As Pope Benedict XVI had opened his own "Twitter"-account (@Pontifex), a minor, yet remarkable fact soon emerged, i.e., while the pope has gathered millions of "followers" from around the globe in a very short period, he himself follows no other accounts than that of himself.

Unsurprisingly, the attitude of Benedict XVI in the area of communication has sometimes raised confusion. While modern means of communication have made it possible that every word spoken by the pope immediately goes public, on a global scale, this has given rise to difficult situations throughout the latest pontificate: in September 2006, the Pope's address at Regensburg (where he once was a professor himself) for a crowd of academics, sparked worldwide and vehement reactions in the Muslim world.[95] It has required complex diplomacy to restore peace and good relationships in this realm. Three years later, the decision to lift the excommunication of four bishops from the Lefebvrist Pius X fraternity was made public. Among them ranked bishop Richard Williamson, who denied the horrors of the Shoah, and once more this sparked public outrage, and even led to political requests from the side of German *Bundeskanzler* Angela Merkel to withdraw the decision. More recently blogs have rambled constantly on the process of a possible reconciliation with the Fraternity of Pius X, a reconciliation that ultimately did not come about under Pope Benedict's rule. In this difficult process, Vatican officials entering in dialogue with the Fraternity were facing repeated denials of the value of Vatican II teaching, while for the pope is was clear that the heritage of the council as such was not under discussion. Religious liberty and interreligious dialogue are assumed as irreversible steps in the evolution of Catholicism.

Ultimately, leaving the recent Vatileaks scandals on the side, unfortunate press coverage figures among one of the most painful episodes of this pontificate, i.e. the scandals concerning the sexual abuse of children by clergy, which had been ignored and neglected for decades. John Paul II had hoped to resolve these problems with his 2001 motu proprio

---

[95] In this address, the pope used a quotation from the medieval Byzantine emperor Manuel II Paleologos, critical of the notion of holy war and the behavior of some of the Islamic faithful. The citation sounded: "show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached." This was soon taken to be the pope's personal opinion of Islam and sparked violent outrage in several Islamic countries. In the wake of the debate, previous statements from Ratzinger were critically reviewed, such as the one found in his Ratzinger's book *Glaube, Wahrheit, Toleranz: Das Christentum und die Weltreligionen* (Freiburg, 2005[4]), p. 116: Wieweit der neue Aufbruch der islamischen Welt von wirklich religiösen Kräften gespeist wird, bleibt gleichfalls zu fragen. Vielerorts—wir sehen es—droht auch hier eine pathologische Verselbständigung des Gefühls, die die Drohungen des Schrecklichen nur verstärkt, von der Pauli, Heisenberg und Fest zu uns gesprochen haben. Es geht nicht anders: Vernunft und Religion müssen wieder zueinander kommen, ohne sich ineinander aufzulösen.

Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela;[96] and Joseph Ratzinger has no personal blame in the affairs. He acted swiftly, asking for forgiveness, and taking the side of the victims, while acknowledging the mistakes committed by members of the clergy. In 2010, he reinforced the rules set out by his predecessor. But still, the toll of the media was high and has affected the pope personally, when wave after wave, new and shameful facts and irregular ways of handling complaints have been thrown out into the public arena.

At the present juncture, it is unwarranted to make claims regarding the historical significance of this pontificate. Suffice it to say, in the end, that Benedict's pontificate has had its own particular characteristics. For one, more than his predecessors, the present pope always remained a theologian, occasionally seeming to induce a functional dissociation that is highly uncommon for those holding the highest office in the Roman Catholic Church. In the introduction to his three volumes devoted to the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the pope, signing under his proper name as Joseph Ratzinger,[97] explained that the positions taken in his trilogy voiced his own personal opinions; and he claimed that his perspectives remain "open for discussion." The pope was able to detach his particular view of theology and salvation history from his universal office as pastor of the Roman Catholic faithful worldwide. The question that follows is the extent to which other proposals can or cannot be discussed freely among theologians, and in this light, much is left open at the beginning of the pontificate of Pope Francis.

Ultimately, Benedict XVI's writings indicated a pivotal direction taken in his pontificate, a willingness to move on with the efforts of "new evangelization," underscored by the establishment, on September 21, 2010, of the Pontifical Council for the New Evangelization,[98] as well as a persistent focus of attention on the roots of Christian faith. The latter has become apparent in the weekly audiences devoted to the discussion of each of the Apostles, next the apostolic fathers, the church fathers, etc. The same goes for the heritage of this pope, laid down in three well-written encyclicals devoted to the theological virtues of charity and hope, under the titles *Deus caritas est*, *Spe salvi*, and *Caritas in veritate*.

[96] John Paul II, *Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela* (April 30, 2001),' *AAS* 93 (2001), 737–9.
[97] Joseph Ratzinger, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 3 Vols. (New York, 2007–12).
[98] Benedict XVI, 'Ubicumque et semper (September 21, 2010),' *AAS* 102 (2010), 789.

AFTERWORD

David G. Schultenover, S.J.

This volume, in whose writing I played no part, is aimed at students pursuing a bachelor's degree. Nevertheless I read it with breathless interest, because it expertly presents a narrative in which I as a professor of historical theology do play a part, one that began with Vatican II. Permit me, then, to approach this afterword autobiographically by relating the narrative of this volume to my own professional theological narrative. Out this experience I conclude with a reflection on the role of history in church and theology and the danger of not learning from it.

I begin with what occurred in my life just at the climax of the Vatican I to Vatican II narrative. I was in my third year of regency as a Jesuit scholastic teaching high school chemistry when newly released council documents appeared (1966). I immediately delved into them and found my imagination lit up with possible implications for both the church and me as a scholastic about to begin four years of theological studies in preparation for ordination. I began the 1967 academic year at the Jesuit theologate at St. Marys, Kansas, with the new course of seminary studies mandated by the council (the theologate moved to St. Louis University the following academic year to change the study environment from the countryside to the city). In the summer vacation times during regency I was also completing a PhD in organic chemistry. In fact, I was just a year away from finishing—my research project was well in hand, most of my dissertation was written, and I had two more courses to take and sit for my comprehensive exams.

After finishing my first year of theology, I faced the question I could not avoid: do I want to be a part of this future church as an organic chemist or as a theologian?—yes, I became *that* interested in theology to pose this question. What does the church I am called to serve as a priest need more at this time in history—a priest-organic chemist or a priest-theologian who sees his role as helping the church appropriate what was loaded in the Vatican II documents? Could I do both?—be an organic chemist and a theologian? With some grasp of my limitations, I answered no. To what was God calling me at this point? The answer would come as I posed the question to my provincial superior at my next "account of conscience."

Should I abandon organic chemistry to pursue a PhD in theology? He and I, it turns out, were on the same track. With some regret and not a little grieving, I left chemistry behind and threw myself into the study of theology in the immediate post-Vatican II era.

It was a heady time in more ways than one. The United States had recently passed through the Cuban Missile Crisis and the assassinations of John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King Jr., and Robert Kennedy; and the Catholic Church was suffering the effects of Pope Paul VI's encyclical *Humanae vitae*. Not unconnected with these traumatic events, the country and much of the West were undergoing a cultural revolution. We were in the midst of the Vietnam War with tumultuous protests against it; we were also experiencing sharp tensions provoked by the struggle for civil rights, women's rights, challenges to traditional authorities, exploration of sexuality and psychedelic drugs, etc. With all this as background, I was facing the question of what to do with the rest of my life: join a movement or continue my vocation as a Jesuit priest with an adjustment that could help prepare for what all the revolutionary energies could mean for the long haul and for the church that would be faced with, in its own way, meeting the religious and social needs of a world population that was increasingly merging across borders. Organic chemistry was no longer in the picture for me. Theology was. Ah, but what kind? That question was a real one, now that neo-Thomism was no longer the only option for studying philosophy and theology.

My first interest in theological studies was hermeneutics—a perfectly reasonable choice. After all, in those years rife with both religious and cultural revolution, the question of what all this means both now and especially for the future pulled at my innards. I explored hermeneutics with a couple of courses, but in the process I discovered that interpreting what anything means drove me to historical contexts, because at root we humans are historical creatures. Yes, we Christians also have our eternal verities—revelation, Scripture, tradition, and institutional structures to keep alive in us the dynamism of the Christian mythos. But within this framework we encounter new and increasingly complex historical events that daily force the question of what they mean in both the short and long terms. How do we engage these events at the level of meaning and incorporate them into the Christian mythos such that the latter gives them a salvific significance?

So I decided to focus first on historical theology—get the dissertation done quickly, then turn to what I was really interested in, namely, hermeneutics: how to interpret all that we humans encounter, past and present,

with a view toward the future. But as I entered into the project that is history, I discovered that I would never exit, at least professionally, into hermeneutics as a concentration; because I discovered that in history, precisely in "doing" history, I found the indispensable method of search for and discovery of meaning.

Let me spell out this discovery by connecting it with the historical narrative that is this volume. First, as I indicated above, I read this volume with breathless interest. Why? Because it not only tells a story—and who doesn't like a story?—but the story it tells is about the great loves of my life—the church, the world, and all its peoples. It's a story about how the church, founded by Jesus Christ on the Apostles, realizes itself historically in the time and place in which we currently live, both in accessible memory of the past (through access to archives) and in the present, in living memory, which tasks us with preparing a future promising for later generations.

I must confess, however, that these loves, while they may have been germinating in me for many years, did not and could not flower until a measure of maturity caught up with me, that is, until I discovered that all humans (and I as a not disinterested example) are by nature interrelational, just as God, in whose image we are created, is by nature interrelational. And therefore, in some eureka moment—albeit a very gradual one—I grasped the existential reality that all human stories are interwoven; that there is no story that is not also in some sense *my* story as well. I could not avoid the conclusion that if God is love (1 John), and if God loves me, sinner that I am, then God also loves all persons and all created and uncreated beings; indeed creation is the ex-pression (*exprimere*) of God who is love. In a sense, then, I as a self-and-other-aware image of God, fell in love with history and with all historical personages. Henceforth, I could never get enough experience of the other as expression of God. I graduated into historical dipsomania; context became for me indispensable to knowing the truth of historical personages and events, all of which are expressions of divine-creaturely interrelational love.

Here is how this awakening played itself out in my life—and it is a lesson that I attempt to communicate, whether overtly or covertly, to my students, readers of my writings, spiritual advisees, and hearers of my homilies. Back to the moment when I had to choose a course of studies toward the PhD. Once I decided on historical theology, I looked for a dissertation topic that most piqued my imagination. Serendipitously (of course, I interpreted this as another graced moment), I fell upon the soi-disant modernist George Tyrrell, who lived and worked in a period that

seemed much like the one the church was going through in the era of Vatican II and following. (It helped my imagination that he too was a Jesuit.) As I was intensely interested in Vatican II—since it was immediate to me and to the church I was called to serve—I surmised that I could learn something of the inner workings of crises by studying the modernist crisis through the eyes of those who lived and interpreted it, Tyrrell and his friends.

Immersing myself in the microhistory of the modernist period (roughly 1890 to 1914) under the direction of von Hügel scholar Lawrence Barmann, I learned that the crisis had a considerable ancestry and progeny, all vitally intriguing in their own rights. Here, I can present only the outlines. I begin with the ancestry—and forego the progeny, as they are well described in the pages of this book. By "ancestry" I mean the world- and church-changing historical events that led to the modernist crisis. It began with the era of revolutions: American, French, and multiple revolutions throughout Europe during the nineteenth century, all of which went quite badly from the perspective of the Vatican—and truth to tell, there was much social unrest, displacement, destruction of property, and loss of life, all of which shook both church and state to the core.

Much has been written about the connections between the American and French Revolutions, but for my purposes here I focus on the French Revolution, because that had the most immediate and profound impact on the Catholic Church. It split "throne and altar" and led throughout the nineteenth century, along with the propagation of Enlightenment thinking and consequent scientific, industrial, and social/cultural revolutions, to an increasing secularization of both property and mind: the states in various countries of Europe took over many of the services that had been under the aegis of the church, especially education and social services. "Liberalism" was invented in the late eighteenth and early ninteenth centuries, and the term, understood primarily as political and with frightening implications for the church, became the shibboleth for all that seemed threatening to the church's life and institutions.

As this volume's narrative makes clear, the destabilization of both state and church from the French Revolution on led local churches to look "beyond the mountains" to Rome as a possible bulwark against the secularizing forces that were encroaching on ecclesial domains. The pope in fact, as head of the universal church, was still a political/religious power to reckon with—no revolutionaries wanted their populations to mount resistance because of religious ties to Rome. Thus ultramontanism became a forceful movement during the nineteenth century (and to this

day), whereby church/political power became increasingly concentrated in the papacy. Concomitantly, of course, this movement weakened the power of local bishops, who increasingly lost courage to govern their dioceses without first checking with Rome.

One of the spinoffs of the church's struggle with liberalism was hierarchical resistance to anything that smacked of liberal thought, including the democratizing tendencies that church leaders feared was spilling over to theological thought as church philosophers and theologians attempted to engage the intellectual developments from the Enlightenment. Kant and then Schleiermacher, with their turns to the subject, were seen as the greatest threats to church order. Along with these threats was the tendency among some schools of philosophy and theology (mostly seminaries at that time) to attempt to meet the stronger strains of emerging non-scholastic thought on their own ground; thus the experimenting with philosophical/theological thought that strayed from the traditional scholastic methodology. Fearing a splintering of the ecclesiastical thought system, Pope Leo XIII issued *Aeterni Patris*, mandating Thomism as the church's unifying philosophical/theological method.

This mandate led to tensions among some theologians who found that the ahistorical approach of neo-Thomism was ineffective for dealing with the new philosophies and theologies emerging from the Enlightenment, particularly among influential Protestant thinkers. This tension led to extramural experimentation by a number of Catholic philosophers and theologians, mostly in Europe and mostly not following a common program—contrary to the impression given by Pius X's *Lamentabili sane exitu* and *Pascendi dominici gregis* defining Modernism and then condemning what they defined; contrary to magisterial wishes, these thinkers were working outside the lines of Thomism or attempting to adapt Thomism to the new strains of philosophical/theological thought. This led, then, to the Vatican's draconian measures to root out Modernism. These measures, which including the establishment of secret vigilance committees in dioceses throughout the world, resulted in the delation—often with insufficient cause—of suspected modernists to the Holy Office of the Inquisition and their dismissal from ecclesiastical faculties. Some suspects were excommunicated; others simply left the church without awaiting formal excommunication. How many philosophers and theologians this involved—probably all were ordained priests—is unknown, and it would take a great deal of sifting through records in the Vatican archives to come up with a reasonably accurate figure. My own estimate from archival research is fewer than fifty. Contrast this with the number

who were investigated by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith after Vatican II: by one estimate, over 230. Of course, by this time the number of theologians worldwide was much larger than during the modernist period. Let me conclude by reflecting on learning from history.

To learn from history, one must be able to read it with at least a good-faith attempt at objectivity and not selectively according to one's self-interests. This is enormously difficult. It takes courageous indifference to remove one's self from desires driven by venal motives or fear of threats to one's position of power. In the Ignatian tradition of striving for indifference, one must be liberated from disordered desires and fears (e.g., of threats to one's security that rests on real or imagined riches, honors, pride), so that one can sincerely ask and desire to know God's will in a particular time and place as over and against one's own will. For the spiritually indifferent, well-ordered person, one's own will is conformed to God's. For the disordered person, one's own will is taken as God's will.

While anti-modernists conflated political liberalism with theological modernism, those the Vatican identified as "modernists" did not. In fact Tyrrell was roundly critical of theological liberalism and of how the Vatican construed "Modernism" as an internally coherent and organized movement. If the so-called "modernists" were united in any one program at all, it was to engage with post-Enlightenment thought, and not in any organized fashion; this over and against those who did philosophy and theology only within the framework of neo-scholasticism. Tyrrell, who studied the texts of Thomas themselves, knew how Thomas's thought differed markedly from that of his neo-scholastic interpreters, and he saw the latter, as did Bernard Lonergan subsequently, as ahistorical, static "classicism" (Lonergan's term for neo-scholastic method).

Among Lonergan's invaluable contributions to philosophical-theological method was the incorporation of historical-mindedness into scholastic philosophy and theology as the only way to bring it up to date and make it serviceable in the post-nineteenth-century academy that sees historical consciousness as a sine qua non for discussing this-worldly realities recognized as historical and historically contingent. This does not mean relative. Certainly relativism is a danger to be avoided, but to incorporate historical consciousness into the attempt to engage and elucidate human realities is merely and quite obviously to engage them on their own terms, i.e., as profoundly historical realities.

In 1966, the year the Vatican II documents were released, Lonergan was asked to address the Canon Law Society of America on the question of "how a community of love [the church] adapts and directs itself for

effective mission and witness."[1] This is precisely the question that Pope John XXIII posed to the Council Fathers, albeit not in so many words; it is the question of *aggiornamento* for the church of Jesus Christ as a profoundly historical reality. Lonergan proceeded to engage this question in "a roundabout fashion" by first reminding his audience that his book *Insight* analyzed "the dynamic structure of human history," and that his *De Verbo Incarnato* argued "a thesis on the *lex crucis* that provides . . . [the] strictly theological complement" to history's structure. He then proceeded to answer the question and in astonishingly few words.

First, however, he had to address "the elephant in the room," that is, what everyone witnessed who followed the concurrent reports from the council and/or read scholarly assessments of the proceedings both on the floor of the council and behind the scenes as these became available. The reports showed that two broad mentalities among the Fathers were in contest from beginning to end, mentalities that this book tracks from Vatican I through the eras of Modernism, the *nouvelle théologie*, Vatican II and the postconciliar period to the very end of Benedict XVI's papacy. These mentalities Lonergan described as "classicist and historicist." Though "not immediately theological," these mentalities, Lonergan averred, were "differences in horizon, in total mentality" that led to differences in theological conclusions. Given such "differences in horizon," Lonergan said, it would be "a major achievement" "for either side really to understand the other." But without that understanding, "the interpretation of Scripture or of other theological sources is most likely to be at cross-purposes."[2]

Lonergan went on to describe how the two mentalities differ first of all by departing from the classical to the modern languages and literature—thus by reason of different linguistic structures; then by departing from classical modes of investigation to modern (Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment) methods of learning and application that have resulted in today's world of stunning diversity and technological achievement. "In every case" of development, Lonergan said, "modernity means the desertion, if not the repudiation, of the old models and methods, and the exercise of freedom, initiative, creativity."[3] For church leaders facing

---

[1] Bernard J.F. Lonergan, 'The Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical-Mindedness,' in *A Second Collection*, ed. William F.J. Ryan and Bernard J. Tyrrell [Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan 13] (Toronto, 1996), pp. 1–9, there 7.

[2] Lonergan, 'The Transition,' p. 2.

[3] Lonergan, 'The Transition,' p. 5.

the destabilization of church and society from the French Revolution to our own time, such an assessment could be and was terrifying.

What Lonergan is describing is the historical process that is not itself theological, but that is the reality into which divine revelation comes: that is, not abstractly, not into unchanging forms and structures, but into the concrete, changing forms and structures of historical living that results in changing meanings. To be sure, there are constants within changing meanings—constants such as virtues like love, truth-telling, doing the good, and loving interrelationality—but these constants are always being realized in historical persons and cultures that develop over time, and so the constants change in their cultural, historical expression and therefore in how meaning is conveyed. Revelation enters into history, and so it is up to historical meaning-makers to make history theological. For Christians, this means it is up to those who in baptism and in their diverse baptismal realities "put on Christ" and therefore "Christify" daily living as interrelational persons.

In this Christic context, what does it mean to learn from history? First of all, it means to learn from revelation, from God who has entered history both in the very act of creation but also concretely and intimately by becoming human in Jesus of Nazareth who thus knows intimately all things human but sin (Heb. 2,17; 4,15); but even here and especially here for the sake of communication of God's love, Paul tells us, God "made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God" (2 Cor. 5, 21 Revised Standard Version). Therefore, we humans exist within a Christic horizon, wherein we are enabled to interpret in truth all reality theologically, as sacrament of God's love, as sacrament of God's presence in history.

Second, it means that as historical persons, we can and must—if we will be wise and obedient (in the etymological sense of "listen carefully")—honor and reverence our ancestors who communed with God as did Adam and Eve "in the garden in the cool of the day" (Gen 3:8), and learn from them what they learned of God and how they applied that learning to their historical living. This learning is to be done both on the level of content but also and more importantly perhaps on the level of method: *how* did *they* and *how* are *we* to discern what is and what is not of God? How are we to walk and talk with God in the cool of the day? To attend only to the *what* of faith, the *fides quae*, the "deposit," without attending also to the *fides qua* is to get ourselves stuck in classicism and so to ignore, or perhaps even flee from, the presence of the living God and the movement of God's Spirit in history.

Third, to continue to draw on Lonergan, reading the signs of the times, as we are all called to do, requires two modes of learning from the past: (1) learning the content of what worked and did not work for our ancestors; and (2) learning from them the method of discerning the movement of the Holy Spirit in our lives today, who is attempting to direct us on the way of salvation, toward wholeness. Given how we have developed, that is, with historical consciousness as endemic to post-Enlightenment cultures, reality and the traces of God therein can no longer be interpreted merely through what has been handed down in the classical manuals of philosophy and theology. Rather, theological interpretation must also arise out of historical understanding. That is, theology must also be *historical* theology; it must limn the workings of God's Spirit in the concrete and changing realities of history. For a "community of love," this means that, in the vagaries of history, we must lovingly attend to the working of God who is love and who, as such, labors to form a community of love, but only with our cooperation, only with our lively reading of the signs of the times and in them the signs of God's traces in our space-time continuum.

Not to turn theology into *historical* theology is to flee from the theological (and every other kind of useful) understanding that is available to us today by reason of historical consciousness. To flee from such understanding is, I would argue, a dereliction of human possibility and results, as Lonergan put it, "in a . . . cumulative process of decline"—this over and against progress that results from a process of insights building cumulatively on previous insights and leading to a body of knowledge that builds historically. In Lonergan's words:

> Flight from understanding blocks the insights that concrete situations demand. There follow unintelligent policies and inept courses of action. The situation deteriorates to demand still further insights and, as they are blocked, policies become more unintelligent and action more inept. What is worse, the deteriorating situation seems to provide the uncritical, biased mind with factual evidence in which the bias is claimed to be verified. So in ever increasing measure intelligence comes to be regarded as irrelevant to practical living. Human activity settles down to a decadent routine, and initiative becomes the privilege of violence.[4]

This is what played itself out in the modernist crisis and in the draconian measures mandated by Pius X to deal with the so-called "modernists." It is also what played itself out in the investigations of theologians and the

[4] Lonergan, 'The Transition,' p. 8.

US women religious in the post-Vatican II era. These unfortunate contretemps are what happens when we do not learn from history; when we do not grasp what we are as inherently historical beings and what the church is as an inherently historical "community of love." In the end, the question mark in this book's title, *Aggiornamento?*, is well placed. The jury remains out on the church's appropriation of Vatican II.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1948–1968, ed. Harold C. Fey (Geneva, 2004).

À la veille du Concile Vatican II: Vota et réactions en Europe et dans le catholicisme oriental, ed. Mathijs Lamberigts and Claude Soetens [IT 9] (Louvain, 1992).

Acerbi, Antonio, *Due ecclesiologie: Ecclesiologia giuridica ed ecclesiologia di communione nella "Lumen gentium"* (Bologna, 1975).

Acta et Documenta Concilio Oecumenico Vaticano II apparando: Series I: *Antepraeparatoria*. Series II: *Praeparatoria* (Vatican City, 1960–95).

Acta Gregorii papae XVI scilicet constitutiones, bullae, litterae apostolicae, epistolae, Pars prima canonica ordine chronologico disposita, ed. Antonio Maria Bernasconi (Rome, 1901–4).

Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II (Vatican City, 1970–99).

Adornato, Giselda, *Paolo VI: Il coraggio della modernità* (Cinisello Balsamo, 2008).

Alberigo, Giuseppe, *Dalla Laguna al Tevere: Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli da San Marco a San Pietro* [TRSR: N.S. 25] (Bologna, 2000).

———, *Jean XXIII devant l'histoire* (Paris, 1989).

———, *Papa Giovanni, 1881–1963* (Bologna, 2000).

Antimodernismus und Modernismus in der katholischen Kirche: Beiträge zur theologiegeschichtlichen Vorfeld des II. Vatikanums, ed. Hubert Wolf [Programm und Wirkungsgeschichte des II. Vatikanums 2] (Paderborn, Munich, Vienna, and Zürich, 1998).

Aschoff, Hans-Georg, *Ludwig Windthorst* [Beiträge zur Katholizismusforschung A: Quellentexte zur Geschichte des Katholizismus 9] (Paderborn, 1991).

Aubert, Roger, *La théologie catholique au milieu du XX^e siècle* [Cahiers de l'actualité religieuse 3] (Tournai, 1954).

———, *Le cardinal Mercier, 1851–1926: Un prélat d'avant-garde*, ed. Jean-Pierre Hendrickx, Jean Pirotte, and Luc Courtois (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1994).

———, *Le pontificat de Pie IX, 1846–1878* [Histoire de l'église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours 21] (Paris, 1952).

———, *Le probleme de l'acte de foi: Données traditionnelles et resultats des controverses récentes* [Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis—Dissertationes ad gradum magistri in Facultate Theologica vel in Facultate Iuris Canonici consequendum conscriptae II/36] (Louvain and Paris, 1945).

Auricchio, John, *The Future of Theology* (Staten Island, 1970).

Baur, Ferdinand Christian, *Der Gegensatz des Katholizismus und Protestantismus* (Tübingen, 1833).

Bautain, Louis, *Philosophie du christianisme* (Strasbourg and Paris, 1835).

Beales, Derek Louis and Eugenio F. Biagini, *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy* (London, 2002).

Belpaire, Françoise, *Vatican I: Les évêques belges et la question de l'infaillibilité pontificale, 1865–1873* (Louvain, 1970).

Bendel-Maidl, Linda, *Tradition und Innovation: Zur Dialektik von historischer und systematischer Perspektive in der Theologie: Am Beispiel von Transformationen in der Rezeption des Thomas von Aquin im 20. Jahrhundert* [Religion—Geschichte—Gesellschaft. Fundamentaltheologische Studien 27] (Münster, 2004).

Beretta, Francesco, *Monseigneur d'Hulst et la science chrétienne: Portrait d'un intellectuel* [Textes, dossiers, documents 16] (Paris, 1996).

Bilanz der Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert, Perspektive, Strohmungen: Motive in der christlichen und nichtchristlichen Welt, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler and Robert Vander Gucht, 3 Vols. (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna, 1969–70).

Bischof, Franz Xaver, *Theologie und Geschichte: Ignaz von Döllinger in der zweiten Hälfte seines Lebens: Ein Beitrag zu seiner Biographie* [Münchener kirchenhistorische Studien 9] (Stuttgart, 1997).
Blondel, Maurice, *L'Action: Essai d'une critique de vie et d'une science de pratique* [Bibliothèque de philosophie contemporaine] (Paris, 1893); reprint [Quadrige 170] (Paris, 1993).
Boersma, Hans, *'Nouvelle Théologie' and Sacramental Ontology: A Return to Mystery* (Oxford and New York, 2009).
Boff, Leonardo, *Church, Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church* (New York NY, 1985).
Bonnefoy, Jean-François, *La nature de la théologie selon saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 1939).
Borgman, Erik, *Edward Schillebeeckx*, Vol. 1: *A Catholic Theology of Culture, 1914–1965* (London and New York, 2003).
Boudignon, Patrice, *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin: Sa vie, son œuvre, sa réflexion* [Histoire] (Paris, 2008).
Bouillard, Henri, *Conversion et grâce chez saint Thomas d'Aquin: Étude historique* [Théologie 1] (Paris, 1944).
Bouma-Prediger, Steven, *The Greening of Theology: The Ecological Models of Rosemary Radford Ruether, Joseph Sittler, and Jürgen Moltmann* (Atlanta, 1995).
Bredeck, Michael, *Das Zweite Vatikanum als Konzil des Aggiornamento: Zur hermeneutischer Grundlegung einer theologischen Konzilsinterpretation* [Paderborner theologische Studien 48] (Paderborn, 2007).
Buonasorte, Nicla, *Tra Roma e Lefebvre: Il tradizionalisme cattolico Italiano e il Concilio Vaticano II* (Rome, 2003).
Capovilla, Loris, *Johannes XXIII: Papst der Konzils, der Einheit und des Friedens* (Zürich, 1963).
Cappellari, Bartolomeo, *Trionfo della Santa Sede e della Chiesa: Contro gli assalti dei novatori combattuti e respinti colle stesse loro armi* (Venice, 1832).
Cardinal Yves Congar, 1904–1995, ed. André Vauchez [Histoire] (Paris, 1999).
Casaroli, Agostino, *Il martirio della pazienza: La Santa Sede e i paesi comunisti, 1963–1989* (Turin, 2000).
Cecconi, Eugenio, *Storia del Concilio ecumenico Vaticano scritta sui documenti originali: Antecedenti*, 3 Vols. (Rome, 1873–9).
Celebrating a Century of Ecumenism: Exploring the Achievements of International Dialogue, In Commemoration of the Centenary of the 1910 Edinburgh World Missionary Conference ed. John A. Radano (Grand Rapids, 2012).
Chantraine, Georges, *Henri de Lubac*, Vol. 1: *De la naissance à la demobilisation, 1896–1919* [Études Lubaciennes 6] (Paris, 2007); Vol. 2: *Les années de formation, 1919–1929* [Études Lubaciennes 7] (Paris, 2009).
Charlier, Louis, *Essai sur le problème théologique* [Bibliothèque Orientations. Section scientifique 1] (Thuillies, 1938).
Chenaux, Philippe, *Il Concilio Vaticano II* (Rome, 2012).
——, *L'église catholique et le communisme en Europe, 1917–1989: De Lénine à Jean Paul II* (Paris, 2010).
——, *Pie XII: Diplomate et Pasteur* [Histoire—Biographie] (Paris, 2003).
Chenu, Marie-Dominique, *Introduction à l'étude de Saint Thomas d'Aquin* [Publications de l'Institut d'études médiévales 11] (Montréal and Paris, 1950).
——, *Spiritualité du travail* [Études religieuses 604–605] (Liège, 1947).
Chiron, Yves, *Paul VI, le pape écartelé* (Paris, 1993).
Christliche Philosophie im katholischen Denken des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts, ed. Emerich Coreth, Walter M. Neidl and Georg Pfligersdorffer, Vol. 2: *Rückgriff auf scholastisches Erbe* (Graz, Vienna and Cologne, 1988).
Codex iuris canonici Pii X Pontificis iussu digestus, Benedicti Papae XV auctoritate promulgatus, ed. Pietro Gasparri (Rome, 1917).

Coleman, John A., *The Evolution of Dutch Catholicism, 1958–1974* (Berkeley, 1978).
Colin, Pierre, *L'audace et le soupçon: La crise du modernisme dans le catholicisme français 1893–1914* [Anthropologiques] (Paris, 1997).
Collins, Peter, *A Twentieth-Century Collision: American Intellectual Culture and Pope John Paul II's Idea of a University* (Lanham, 2010).
Combes, Émile, *Mon ministère: Mémoires 1902–1905* (Paris, 1956).
Congar, Yves, *After Nine Hundred Years: The Background of the Schism Between the Eastern and Western Churches* (Chevetogne, 1954).
——, *Chrétiens désunis: Principes d'un œcuménisme catholique* [Unam Sanctam, 1] (Paris, 1937).
——, *La Tradition et les traditions*, Vol. 1: *Essai historique*; Vol. 2: *Essai théologique* [Le signe] (Paris, 1960).
——, *Mon Journal du Concile*, ed. Éric Mahieu, 2 Vols (Paris, 2002).
——, *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat* (Paris, 1953).
Connolly, James M., *The Voices of France: A Survey of Contemporary Theology in France* (New York, 1961).
Continuity and Plurality in Catholic Theology, ed. Anthony J. Cernera (Fairfield, 1998).
Copleston, Frederick C., *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. 7: *Modern Philosophy: From the Post-Kantian Idealists to Marx, Kierkegaard and Nietzsche* (New York, 1994),Vol. 9: *Modern Philosophy: From the French Revolution to Sartre, Camus, and Lévi-Strauss* (New York, 2003).
Costigan, Richard, *Vatican I and Infallibility: The Consensus of the Church and Papal Infallibility: A Study in the Background of Vatican I* (Washington DC, 2005).
Cousins, Norman, *The Improbable Triumvirate: An Asterisk to the Hopeful Year 1962–1963* (New York, 1972).
Cox, Harvey, *The silencing of Leonardo Boff: The Vatican and the Future of World Christianity* (Bloomington, 1988).
Crews, Clyde F., *English Catholic Modernism: Maude Petre's Way of Faith* (Notre Dame, 1984).
D'Costa, Gavin, *Christianity and the World Religions: Disputed Questions in the Theology of Religions* (Malden, 2009).
Daniélou, Jean, *Et qui est mon prochain? Mémoires* (Paris, 1974).
de Bonald, Louis, *Réflexions sur l'accord des dogmes avec la raison*, ed. Vincent Bouat [La nuit surveillée] (Paris, 2012).
——, *Théorie du pouvoir politique et religieux dans la société civile, démontrée par le raisonnement et par l'histoire* (Paris, 1796).
de Bujanda, Jesus Martinéz, *Index librorum prohibitorum, 1600–1966* [Index des livres interdits 11] (Montréal, 2002).
de Chateaubriand, François-René, *Essai sur les Révolutions: Génie du christianisme*, ed. Maurice Regard [Bibliothèque de la Pléiade 272] (Paris, 1978).
de Lamennais, Hugues-Félicité, *Correspondance Générale*, ed. Louis Le Guillou, 9 Vols. (Paris, 1972–82).
——, *De la différence en matière de religion*, ed. Philippe Riviale [À la recherche des sciences sociales] (Paris, 2007).
de Lubac, Henri, *Augustinisme et théologie moderne* [Théologie 63] (Paris, 1965; reprinted in the series "Œuvres complètes" 13, Paris, 2009).
——, *Catholicisme: Les aspects sociaux du dogme* [Unam sanctam 3] (Paris, 1938; reprinted in the series "Œuvres complètes" 7, Paris, 2003).
——, *Surnaturel: Études historiques* [Théologie 8] (Paris, 1946).
de Maistre, Joseph, *Du Pape* (Lyon and Paris, 1819).
Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, ed. Norman P. Tanner, Vol. 2: *Trent to Vatican II* (London and Washington, 1990).
Dejaifve, Georges, *Pape et évêques au premier Concile du Vatican* (Bruges, 1961).
del Re, Niccolò, *La Curia Romana: Lineamenti storico-giuridici*, (Rome, 1970).
Desouche, Marie-Thérèse, *Le Christ dans l'histoire selon le pape Pie XI: Un prélude à Vatican II?* [Cogitatio fidei 265] (Paris, 2008).

Dick, John A., *The Malines Conversations Revisited* [BETL 85] (Louvain, 1989).
Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement, ed. Nicholas Lossky et al. (Geneva, 2002).
Dignitatis Humanae: La Libertà religiosa in Paolo VI, ed. Rodolfo Rossi [Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Paolo VI 29] (Brescia, 2007).
Dizionario di teologia fondamentale, ed. Réné Latourelle and Rino Fisichella (Assisi, 1990).
Doing the Truth in Charity: Statements of Pope Paul VI, Popes John Paul I, John Paul II, and the Secretariat for Christian Unity, 1964–1980, ed. Thomas F. Stransky and John B. Sheerin [Ecumenical Documents 1] (New York, 1982).
Dolan, Jay, *The American Catholic Experience* (Garden City, 1992).
Doyle, Dennis M., *Communion Ecclesiology: Vision and Versions* (Maryknoll, 2000).
Duffy, Eamon, *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes* (London, 1997).
Dunn, Dennis J., *The Catholic Church and Russia: Popes, Patriarchs, Tsars and Commissars* (Burlington, 2004).
Dupuy, André, *La diplomatie du Saint-Siège après le II Concile du Vatican: Le Pontificat de Paul VI, 1963–1978* (Paris, 1980).
Dushnyck, Walter, *The Ukrainian-Rite Catholic Church at the Ecumenical Council, 1962–1965* (New York, 1967).
Enchiridion Biblicum: Documenti della Chiesa sulla Sacra Scrittura, ed. Alfio Filippi and Erminio Lora [Strumenti] (Bologna, 1994²).
Enciclopedia dei papi, ed. Manlio Simonetti, 3 Vols. (Rome, 2000).
Ernesti, Jörg, *Ökumene im dritten Reich: Einheit und Erneuerung* (Paderborn, 2007).
——, *Paul VI: Der vergessene Papst* (Freiburg, 2012).
Experiences, Organisations and Bodies at Vatican II, ed. Maria Teresia Fattori and Alberto Melloni [IT 21] (Louvain, 1999).
Faggioli, Massimo, *Il vescovo e il concilio: Modello episcopale e aggiornamento al Vaticano II* [TRSR 36] (Bologna, 2005).
——, *Vatican II: The Battle for Meaning* (New York NY, 2012).
Famerée, Joseph and Gilles Routhier, *Yves Congar* [Initiations aux théologiens] (Paris, 2008).
Féret, Henri-Marie, *Connaissance biblique de Dieu* [Épiphanie] (Paris, 1955).
——, *L'Apocalypse de saint Jean: Vision chrétienne de l'histoire* [Témoignages chrétiens] (Paris, 1943).
Flamini, Roland, *Pope, Premier, President: The Cold War Summit That Never Was* (New York, 1980).
Fogarty, Gerald P., *American Catholic Biblical Scholarship: A History from the Early Republic to Vatican II* (New York, 1989).
——, *The Vatican and the American Catholic Hierarchy from 1870 to 1965* (Wilmington, 1983).
Fouilloux, Étienne, *La collection Sources chrétiennes: Éditer les Pères de l'Église au XX^e siècle* (Paris, 1995).
——, *Les catholiques et l'unité chrétienne du XIX au XX siècle: Itinéraires européens d'expression française* (Paris, 1982).
——, *Les chrétiens français entre crise et liberation, 1937–1947* [XX^e siècle] (Paris, 1997).
——, *Une église en quête de liberté: La pensée catholique française entre modernisme et Vatican II, 1914–1962* [Anthropologiques] (Paris, 1998).
Frey, Christoph, *Mysterium der Kirche, Öffnung zur Welt: Zwei Aspekte der Erneuerung französischer katholischer Theologie* [Kirche und Konfession 14] (Göttingen, 1969).
Friedrich, Johann, *Documenta ad illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum* (Nördlingen, 1871).
Frohschammer, Jacob, *Ueber den Ursprung der menschlichen Seelen* (Munich, 1854).
From Trent to Vatican II: Historical and Theological Investigations, ed. Raymond Bulman and Frederick J. Parrella (New York NY, 2006).
Gangl, Peter, *Franz Ehrle (1845–1934) und die Erneuerung der Scholastik nach die Enzyklika 'Aeterni Patris'* [Quellen und Studien zur neueren Theologiegeschichte 7] (Regensburg, 2006).

Gardeil, Ambroise, *Le donné révélé et la théologie* [Bibliothèque théologique 4] (Paris, 1909, second edition 1932).
Gertz, Kurt-Peter, *Joseph Turmel, 1859–1943: Ein theologiegeschichtlicher Beitrag zum Problem der Geschichtlichkeit der Dogmen* [Disputationes theologicae 2] (Bern and Frankfurt am Main, 1975).
Geschichte des kirchlichen Lebens in den Deutschsprachigen Ländern seit dem Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts, ed. Erwin Gatz (Freiburg, 2008).
Gianotti, Daniele, *I Padri della Chiesa al concilio Vaticano II: La teologia patristica nella Lumen gentium* [Biblioteca di teologia dell'evangelizzazione 6] (Bologna, 2010).
Gibellini, Rosino, *La teologia del xx secolo* [Biblioteca di teologia contemporanea 69] (Brescia, 2004[5]).
Gilson, Étienne, *Le thomisme: Introduction à la philosophie de Saint Thomas d'Aquin* [Études de philosophie médiévale 1] (Strasbourg, 1919; sixth edition, Paris, 1964; seventh reprint of the sixth edition, 1997).
Giselda, Adornato, *Cronologia dell'episcopato di Giovanni Battista Montini a Milano: 4 gennaio 1955–21 giugno 1963* (Brescia and Rome, 2002).
Glaube im Prozess: Christsein nach dem II. Vatikanum, ed. Elmar Klinger and Klaus Wittstadt (Freiburg, 1984).
Goichot, Émile, *Alfred Loisy et ses amis* [Histoire] (Paris, 2002).
Gough, Austin, *Paris and Rome: The Gallican Church and the Ultramontane Campaign 1848–1953* (Oxford, 1986).
Grootaers, Jan, *Actes et acteurs à Vatican II* [BETL 139] (Louvain, 1998).
——, *De Vatican II à Jean-Paul II: Le grand tournant de l'église catholique* (Paris, 1981).
——, *Heurs et malheurs de la collégialité: Pontificats et synodes face à la réception de Vatican II* [ANL 69] (Louvain, 2012).
——, *Primauté et collégialité: Le dossier de Gérard Philips sur la Nota Explicativa Praevia, Lumen Gentium, Chapître III* [BETL 72] (Louvain, 1986).
——, *Rome et Genève à la croisée des chemins, 1968–1972: Un ordre du jour inachevé* (Paris, 2005).
Grootaers, Jan and Jan Jans, *La régulation des naissances à Vatican II: Une semaine de crise* [ANL 43] (Louvain, 2002).
Gross, Michael, *The War Against Catholicism: Liberalism and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Ann Arbor, 2004).
Guardini, Romano, *Vom Sinn der Kirche: Fünf Vorträge* (Mainz, 1922, fourth edition 1955).
Guarino, Thomas G., *Foundations of Systematic Theology* [Theology for the Twenty-First Century] (New York and London, 2005).
Guasco, Maurilio, *Modernismo: I fatti, le idée, i personaggi* (Cinisello Balsamo, 1995).
Guenel, Jean, *La dernière guerre du Pape: Les Zouaves pontificaux au secours du Saint Siège, 1860–1870* [Histoire] (Rennes, 1998).
Gugelot, Frédéric, *La conversion des intellectuels au catholicisme en France, 1885–1935* (Paris, 1998).
Guillet, Jacques, *La théologie catholique en France de 1914 à 1960* (Paris, 1988).
Guitton, Jean, *Dialog mit Paulus VI.* (Frankfurt, 1969).
Gunton, Colin E., Stephen R. Holmes and Murray A. Rae, *The Practice of Theology*, (London, 2001).
Gutiérrez, Gustavo, *A Theology of Liberation: History Politics and Salvation* (New York, 1973).
Haight, Roger, *Christian Community in History*, 2 Vols. (New York, 2005).
Hamer, Jérôme, *L'église est une communion* [Unam sanctam 40] (Paris, 1962).
Handboek Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Kampen, 2006).
Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, ed. Hubert Jedin, Parts VI/1–2, and VII (Freiburg, Basel and Vienna, 1971–79).
Hebblethwaite, Peter, *John XXIII, Pope of the Council* (London, 1984).
——, *The First Modern Pope* (London, 1993).

——, *The Year of Three Popes* (London, 1978).
Hennessy, James, *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States* (New York, 1981).
Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil., ed. Peter Hünermann and Bernd Jochen Hilberath, 5 Vols., Vol. 1: *Die Dokumente des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils. Konstitutionen, Dekrete, Erklärungen*; Vol. 2: *Sacrosanctum Concilium—Inter mirifica—Lumen gentium*; Vol. 3: *Orientalium Ecclesiarum—Unitatis redintegratio—Christus Dominus—Optatam totius—Perfectae caritatis—Gravissimum educationis—Nostra aetate—Dei Verbum*; Vol. 4: *Apostolicam actuositatem—Dignitatis humanae—Ad gentes—Presbyterorum ordinis—Gaudium et spes*; Vol. 5: *Die Dokumente des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils: Theologische Zusammenschau und Perspektiven* (Freiburg, 2004–6).
Hill, Harvey, *The Politics of Modernism: Alfred Loisy and the Scientific Study of Religion* (Washington DC, 2002).
Histoire du christianisme, ed. Jean-Marie Mayeur, Ch. & L. Pietri, A. Vauchez, M. Venard, Vol. 11: *Libéralisme, industrialisation, expansion européenne, 1830–1914* (Paris, 1995); Vol. 12: *Guerres mondiales et totalitarismes, 1914–1958* (Paris, 1990); Vol. 13: *Crises et renouveau, de 1958 à nos jours* (Paris, 2000).
Histoire et théologie, ed. Jean-Dominique Durand (Paris, 1994).
History of Vatican II, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak; 5 Vols: Vol. 1: *Announcing and Preparing Vatican Council II. Toward a New Era in Catholicism*; Vol. 2: *The Formation of the Council's Identity. First Period and Intersession, October 1962–September 1963*; Vol. 3: *The Mature Council. Second Period and Intersession, September 1963–September 1964;* Vol. 4: *Church as Communion. Third Period and Intersession, September 1964–September 1965*; Vol. 5: *The Council and the Transition. Fourth Period and the End of the Council, September–December 1965* (New York and Louvain, 1995–2006).
Horn, Gerd-Rainer, *Western European Liberation Theology: The First Wave, 1924–1959* (Oxford, 2008).
Houtin, Albert, *La question biblique chez les catholiques de France en XIX^e siècle* (Paris, 1902).
Hutchinson, Robert, *Their Kingdom Come: Inside the Secret World of Opus Dei* (New York, 1997).
Ickx, Johan, *La Santa Sede tra Lamennais e San Tommaso d'Aquino: La condanna di Gerard Casimir Ubaghs e della dottrina dell'Università Cattolica di Lovanio, 1834–1870* [Collectanea archivi vaticani 56] (Vatican, 2005).
Il dossier del Catechismo Olandese, ed. Aldo Chiaruttini (Milan, 1968).
Il Vaticano fra attese e celebrazione, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo [TRSR: N.S. 13] (Bologna, 1995).
Iserloh, Erwin, *Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler, 1811–1877* [Beiträge zur Katholizismusforschung A, Quellentexte zur Geschichte des Katholizismus 4] (Paderborn, 1990).
Italy in the Nineteenth Century, 1796–1900, ed. John A. Davis [The short Oxford History of Italy] (Oxford, 2000).
Jacques Duquesne interroge le Père Chenu: Un théologien en liberté [Les interviews] (Paris, 1975).
Janse, Wim and Jurjen Vis, *Staf en Storm: Het herstel van de bisschoppelijke hiërarchie in Nederland in 1853: Actie en reactie* (Hilversum, 2002).
Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar: 'Une vie pour la vérité' [Les interviews] (Paris, 1975).
Jefferson Davis: Private letters, 1823–1889, ed. Hudson Strode (New York, 1967).
John Paul I, *Illustrissimi: The Letters of Pope John Paul I*, preface by Cardinal Hume, translated by Isabel Quigly (London, 1979).
Joseph de Maistre and the Legacy of Enlightenment, ed. Carolina Armenteros and Richard A. Lebrun [Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 1] (Oxford, 2011).
Jossua, Jean-Pierre, *Le Père Congar: La théologie au service du peuple de Dieu* [Chrétiens de tous les temps 20] (Paris, 1967).
Kasper, Walter, *Die Lehre von der Tradition in der römische Schule: Giovanni Perrone, Carlo Passaglia, Clemens Schrader* [Gesammelte Schriften 1] (Freiburg, 2011).

Katholiken und Gewerkschaftsbewegung, 1890–1945, ed. Herbert Hömig (Paderborn, 2003).
Kelly, James J., *The Letters of Baron Friedrich von Hügel and Maude Petre: The Modernist Movement in England* [ANL 44] (Louvain, 2003).
Kelly, Joseph F., *The Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church: A History* (Collegeville, 2009).
Ker, Ian, *John Henry Newman: A Biography* (Oxford, 1989).
Ker, Ian and Terrence Merrigan, *The Cambridge Companian to John Henry Newman* (Cambridge, 2009).
Kerr, Fergus, *After Aquinas: Versions of Thomism* (Malden, 2002).
——, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians: From Neoscholasticism to Nuptial Mysticism* (Malden, 2007).
Kiener, Anne, *Les vieux-catholiques de Vatican I à Vatican II: Un siècle de rupture avec Rome et d'union avec Utrecht* (Strasbourg, 2000).
Kirche und Katholizismus seit 1945, ed. Erwin Gatz, 5 Vols., Vol 1: *Mittel-, West- und Nordeuropa*; Vol. 2: *Ostmittel-, Ost- und SüdostEuropa*; Vol. 3: *Italien und Spanien*; Vol. 4: *Die Britischen Inseln und Nordamerika*; Vol. 5: *Die Länder Asiens* (Paderborn, 1998–2005).
Kolfhaus, Florian, *Pastorale Lehrverkundigung: Grundmotiv des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils. Untersuchungen zu Unitatis redintegratio, Dignitatis humanae, und Nostra aetate* [Theologia mundi ex urbe: Römische Studien 2] (Berlin, 2010).
Kracht, Hans Joachim, *Adolf Kolping: Priester, Pädagoge, Publizist im Dienst christlicher Sozialreform* (Freiburg, 1993).
Krieg, Robert Anthony, *Romano Guardini: A Precursor of Vatican II* (Notre Dame, 1997).
Küng, Hans, *Christianity and the World Religions: Paths of Dialogue with Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism* (New York, 1986).
——, *Unfehlbar? Eine Anfrage* (Zürich, 1970).
L'Autorité et les autorités: L'herméneutique théologique de Vatican II, ed. Gilles Routhier and Guy Jobin [Unam sanctam: N.S. 3] (Paris, 2010).
L'église dans l'oeuvre du père Lacordaire, ed. Yvonne Frontier and Henri-Marie Féret [Unam sanctam 45] (Paris, 1963).
L'eredità del magisterio di Pio XII, ed. Philippe Chenaux (Rome, 2010).
L'hommage différé au Père Chenu [Théologies] (Paris, 1990).
La censure d'Alfred Loisy, 1903: Les documents des congregations de l'Index et du Saint Office, ed. Claus Arnold & Giacomo Losito (Rome, 2009).
La parole du salut, ed. Bernard Sesboüé and Christophe Theobald [Histoire des dogmes 4] (Paris, 1996).
La théologie catholique entre intransigeance et renouveau: La réception des mouvements préconciliaires à Vatican II, ed. Gilles Routhier, Philippe J. Roy and Karim Schelkens [Bibliothèque de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique 95] (Turnhout, 2011).
La théologie entre deux siècles: Bilan et perspectives, ed. Jean-Marie Sevrin and André Haquin [CRTL 34] (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2002).
Labourdette, Marie-Michel, Marie-Joseph Nicolas, and Raymond-Léopold Bruckberger, *Dialogue théologique: Pièces du débat entre 'La Revue Thomiste' d'une part et les R.R. P.P. de Lubac, Daniélou, Bouillard, Fessard, von Balthasar, S.J., d'autre part* (Toulouse, 1947).
Lacordaire, Henri-Dominique, *Considérations sur le système philosophique de M. de La Mennais* (Paris, 1834).
——, *Mémoire pour le rétablissement en France de l'ordre des frères prêcheurs* (Paris, 1839).
Lafage, Franck, *Du refus au schisme: Les traditionnalistes catholiques* (Paris, 1989).
——, *Le comte Joseph de Maistre, 1753–1821: Itinéraire intellectual d'un théologien de la politique* [chemins de la mémoire] (Paris, 1998).
Lai, Benny, *Il papa non eletto: Giuseppe Siri Cardinale di Santa Romana Chiesa* (Rome, 1993).
François Laplanche, *La crise de l'origine: La science catholique des Évangiles et l'histoire au XX^e siècle* [Bibliothèque de l'évolution de l'humanité] (Paris, 2006).

Launay, Marcel, *La papauté à l'aube du XX^e siècle: Léon XIII et Pie X, 1878–1914* (Paris, 1997).
Le devenir de la théologie catholique mondiale depuis Vatican II, 1965–1999, ed. Joseph Doré [Sciences théologiques et religieuses] (Paris, 2000).
Le monde contemporain et la Bible, ed. Claude Savart and Jacques-Noël Aletti [Bible de tous les temps 8] (Paris, 1985).
Le pontificat de Leon XIII: Renaissances du Saint-Siège?, ed. Philippe Levillain [Collection de l'école française de Rome 368] (Rome, 2006).
Le role de Montini-Paul VI dans la réforme liturgique [Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Paolo VI 5] (Rome, 1987).
Le Roy, Édouard, *Dogme et critique* [Études de philosophie et de critique religieuse] (Paris, 1907).
Leinsle, Ulrich G., *Einführung in die scholastische Theologie* [UTB für Wissenschaft—Uni-Taschenbücher 1865] (Paderborn, 1995).
Leprieur, François, *Quand Rome condamne: Dominicains et prêtres-ouvriers* [Terre humaine] (Paris, 1989).
Les Pères de l'Église au XX^e siècle: Histoire, littérature, théologie: L'aventure des Sources chrétiennes [Patrimoines: Christianisme] (Paris, 1997).
Levillain, Philippe, *La mécanique politique de Vatican II: La majorité et l'unanimité dans un concile* (Paris, 1975).
Life with a Mission: Cardinal Willem Marinus van Rossum CSsR, 1854–1932, ed. Vefie Poels, Theo Salemink, Hans de Valk (Gent, 2011).
Livingston, James C., *Modern Christian Thought*, Vol. 1: *The Enlightenment and the Nineteenth Century* (Minneapolis, 1997, second edition 2006).
Loisy, Alfred, *Autour d'un petit livre* (Paris, 1903).
——, *L'Évangile et l'église* (Paris, 1902).
——, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire religieuse de notre temps*, 3 Vols. (Paris, 1930–31).
Loome, Thomas Michael, *Liberal Catholicism—Reform Catholicism—Modernism: A Contribution to a New Orientation in Modernist Research* [TTS 14] (Mainz, 1979).
Mannion, Gerard, *The Vision of John Paul II: Assessing his Thought and Influence* (Collegeville, 2008).
Marchetto, Agostino, *Il Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II: Contrappunti per la sua storia* [Storia e attualità 17] (Vatican, 2005).
Marchione, Margherita, *Pope Pius XII: History and Hagiography* (Vatican City, 2010).
Marini, Piero, *A Challenging Reform: Realizing the Vision of the Liturgical Renewal* (Collegeville, 2007).
Marion, Jean-Luc, *God Without Being* (Chicago, 1991).
Maritain, Jacques, *Le feu nouveau: Le paysan de la Garonne*, preface and critical edition by Michel Fourcade (Geneva, 2007).
Martano, Valeria, *Athenagoras il patriarca, 1886–1972: Un cristiano fra crisi della coabitazione e utopia ecumenica* [TRSR: N.S. 17] (Bologna, 1996).
McBrien, Richard P., *Catholicism*, 2 Vols. (Minneapolis, 1980).
McCool, Gerald A., *From Unity to Pluralism: The Internal Evolution of Thomism* (New York, 1989, fourth edition 2002).
——, *Nineteenth-Century Scholasticism: The Search for a Unitary Method* (New York, 1989, third edition 1999).
——, *The Neo-Thomists* [Marquette Studies in Philosophy 3] (Milwaukee, 1994).
McGreevy, John, *Catholicism and American Freedom* (New York, 2003).
Melloni, Alberto, *L'Altra Roma: Politica e S. Sede durante il Concilio Vaticano II, 1959–1965* (Bologna, 2000).
Mersch, Émile, *La théologie du Corps mystique* [Museum Lessianum: Section théologique 38–9], 2 Vols. (Paris, 1944).
——, *Le Corps mystique du Christ: Étude de théologie historique* [Museum Lessianum: Section théologique 28–9], 2 Vols. (Louvain, 1933).

Mettepenningen, Jürgen, *Nouvelle Théologie—New Theology: Inheritor of Modernism, Precursor of Vatican II* (London and New York, 2010).
Miccoli, Giovanni, *Le pontificat de Jean Paul II: Un gouvernement contrasté* (Brussels, 2012).
Milbank, John, *The Suspended Middle: Henri de Lubac and the Debate concerning the Supernatural* (Grand Rapids, 2005).
Miller, William D., *Dorothy Day: A Biography* (San Francisco, 1982).
Minvielle, Bernard, *L'apostolat des laics à la veille du Concile, 1949–59: Histoire des Congrès mondiaux de 1951 et 1957* [Studia friburgensia: Series historica 2] (Fribourg, 2001).
Möhler, Johann Adam, *Unity in the Church or the Principle of Catholicism Presented in the Spirit of the Church Fathers of the First Three Centuries*, ed. Peter C. Erb (Washington DC, 1994).
Moltmann, Jürgen, *Theologie der Hoffnung: Untersuchungen zur Begründung und zu den Konsequenzen einer christlichen Eschatologie* (Munich, 1964).
Montagnes, Bernard, *Le père Lagrange, 1855–1938: L'exégèse catholique dans la crise moderniste* [Histoire] (Paris, 1995).
——, *Marie-Joseph Lagrange: Une biographie critique* [Histoire—Biographie] (Paris, 2004).
More Than One Way: Four Views on Salvation in a Pluralistic World, ed. Dennis R. Okholm and Thimoty R. Phillips (Grand Rapids, 1995).
Newman, John Henry, *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* (Oxford, 1870).
Nichols, Aidan, *A Pope and a Council on the Sacred Liturgy: A Tale of Two Documents* (Farnborough, 2002).
Nielsen, Fredrik Kristian, *History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1875).
Nodet, Bernard, *Le curé d'Ars: Sa pensée, son cœur* (Paris, 1997).
Noonan, John Thomas, *The Lustre of Our Country: The American Experience of Religious Freedom* (Berkeley, 1998).
O'Brien, David J., *Isaac Hecker: An American Catholic* (New York, 1992).
O'Gara, Margaret, *Triumph in Defeat: Infallibility, Vatican I and the French Minority Bishops* (Washington DC, 1988).
O'Malley, John W., *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge and London, 2008).
Osswald, Bernhard, *Anton Günther: Theologisches Denken im Kontext einer Philosophie der Subjektivität* [Abhandlungen zur Philosophie, Psychologie, Soziologie der Religion, und Ökumenik N.F. 43] (Paderborn, 1990).
Pahud de Moranges, Elke, *Philosophie und kirchliche Autorität: Der Fall Jakob Frohschammer vor der römischen Indexkongregation* [Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation 4] (Paderborn, 2005).
Paolo VI e i problemi ecclesiologici al Concilio [Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Paolo VI 7] (Brescia and Rome, 1989).
Paolo VI e l'ecumenismo [Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Paolo VI 23] (Brescia and Rome, 2001).
Paolo VI e la collegialità episcopale [Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Paolo VI 15] (Brescia and Rome, 1995).
Patelos, Constantin G., *La politique de latinisation au sein de la commission préparatoire de Vatican I* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1969).
Paul, Christophe, *Le concile Vatican I* (Paris, 2000).
Paul VI et les réformes institutionnelles dans l'église [Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Paolo VI 6] (Rome, 1987).
Pelikan, Jaroslav, *Confessor Between East and West: A Portrait of Ukrainian Cardinal Josyf Slipyj* (Grand Rapids MI, 1990).
Pepper, George B., *The Boston Heresy Case in View of the Secularization of Religion: A Case Study in the Sociology of Religion* (Lewiston, 1988).
Personenlexikon zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil, ed. Michael Quisinsky and Peter Walter (Freiburg, 2012)
Petit, Vincent, *Église et nation: La question liturgique en France au XIX siècle* [Histoire] (Rennes, 2010).

Philibert, Anne, *Lacordaire et Lamennais* (Paris, 2009).
Philips, Gerard, *L'église et son mystère au deuxième concile du Vatican: Histoire, texte et commentaire de la Constitution Lumen gentium*, 2 Vols. (Paris, 1967–8).
——, *Le rôle du laïcat dans l'église* [Cahiers de l'actualité religieuse] (Paris, 1954).
Phillips, Walter Alison, *Modern Europe, 1815–1899* (London, 1902).
Pierrard, Pierre, *Jacques Gaillot* (Paris, 2002).
Plummer, Alfred, *Conversations with Dr. Döllinger 1870–1890*, ed. Robrecht Boudens and Leo Kenis [BETL 67] (Louvain, 1985).
Poggi, Gianfranco, *Catholic Action in Italy* (Stanford, 1967).
Pollard, John, *Catholicism in Modern Italy: Religion, Society and Politics since 1861* (London and New York).
——, *The Unknown Pope: Benedict XV (1914–1922) and the Pursuit of Peace* (London, 1999).
Ponga, Silouane, *L'Écriture, âme de la théologie: Le problème de la suffisance matérielle des Écritures* [Théologies] (Paris, 2008).
Pottmeyer, Hermann Josef, *Der Glaube vor dem Anspruch der Wissenschaft: Die Konstitution über den katholischen Glauben Dei Filius des ersten Vatikanischen Konzils und die unveröffentlichten theologischen Voten der vorbereitenden Kommission* (Freiburg, 1968).
Potworowski, Christophe F., *Contemplation and Incarnation: The Theology of Marie-Dominique Chenu* [McGill-Queen's Studies in the History of Ideas 33] (Montreal, 2001).
Poulat, Émile, *Intégrisme et catholicisme integral: Un réseau secret international moderniste, la Sapinière, 1909–1921* [Religion et sociétés] (Tournai, 1969).
——, *Les prêtres-ouvriers: Naissance et fin* [Religion et sociétés] (Tournai, 1965, the second edition appeared in the series "Histoire", Paris, 1999).
Pour une histoire du monde catholique au 20e siècle: Wallonie-Bruxelles: Guide du chercheur, ed. Jean Pirotte and Guy Zélis [ARCA: Sillages 6] (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2003).
Prévotat, Jacques, *Les catholiques et l'Action française: Histoire d'une condamnation, 1899–1939* [Pour une histoire du XXe siècle] (Paris, 2001).
Prinz, Julia D.E., *Endangering Hunger for God: Johann Baptist Metz and Dorothee Sölle at the Interface of Biblical Hermeneutic and Christian Spirituality* (Munster, 2007).
Prior, Joseph G., *The Historical Critical Method in Catholic Exegesis* [Tesi Gregoriana. Serie Teologia 50] (Rome, 1999).
Quisinsky, Michael, *Geschichtlicher Glaube in einer geschichtlichen Welt: Der Beitrag von M.-D. Chenu, Y. Congar und H.-M. Féret zum II. Vaticanum* [Dogma und Geschichte 6] (Berlin, 2007).
Ratzinger, Joseph, *Theologische Prinzipienlehre: Bausteine zur Fundamentaltheologie* (Munich, 1982).
Réceptions de Vatican II: Le concile au risque de l'histoire et des espaces humaines, ed. Gilles Routhier [IT 28] (Louvain, 2004).
Religion under Siege, ed. Lieve Gevers and Jan Bank, 2 Vols.; Vol. 1: *The Roman Catholic Church in Occupied Europe, 1939–1950*; Vol. 2: *Protestant, Orthodox and Muslim Communities in Occupied Europe, 1939–1950* [ANL 56] (Louvain, Paris, and Dudley, 2007).
Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology, ed. Gabriel Flynn and Paul D. Murray (Oxford, 2012).
Rondet, Henri, *Vatican I: Le concile de Pie IX, la préparation, les méthodes de travail, les schémas resté en suspens* (Paris, 1962).
Ross, Ronald J., *The Failure of Bismarck's Kulturkampf: Catholicism and State Power in Imperial Germany 1871–1887* (Washington DC, 2000).
Routhier, Gilles, *La Réception d'un concile* (Paris, 1993).
Roy, Philippe J., *Bibliographie du Concile Vatican II* [Atti e documenti 34] (Vatican City, 2012).
——, *Le Coetus Internationalis Patrum: Un groupe d'opposants au sein du Concile Vatican II*, 8 Vols. [unpublished dissertation] (Québec, 2011).
Scatena, Silvia, *In populo pauperum: La chiesa latinoamericana dal concilio a Medellín, 1962–1968* (Bologna, 2007).

——, *La fatica della libertà: L'elaborazione della dichiarazione "Dignitatis humanae" sulla libertà religiosa del Vaticano II* [TRSR: N.S. 31] (Bologna, 2003).
Schäfer, Theo, *Die erkenntnistheoretische Kontroverse Kleutgen-Günther: Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Neuscholastik* (Paderborn, 1961).
Schatz, Klaus, *Vaticanum I, 1869–1870*. Bd. 1: *Vor der Eröffnung*; Bd. 2: *Von der Eröffnung bis zur Konstitution Dei Filius*, Bd. 3: *Unfehlbarheitsdiskussion und Rezeption* (Paderborn, 1992–3).
Schelkens, Karim, *Catholic Theology of Revelation on the Eve of Vatican II: A Redaction History of the Schema de fontibus Revelationis* [BSCH 41] (Leiden and Boston, 2010).
Schmidt, Stjepan, *Augustin Bea: Der Kardinal der Einheit* (Graz, Vienna, Cologne, 1989).
Schneider, Delphine, *Monsignor Henry E. Manning and the First Vatican Council*, (Strasbourg, 2008).
Schoonenberg, Piet, *Theologie als geloofsvertolking: Het proefschrift van 1948* [Documenta libraria 36], ed. Leo Kenis and Jürgen Mettepenningen (Louvain, 2008).
Schultenover, David G., *George Tyrrell: In Search of Catholicism* (Shepherdstown, 1981).
Scully, Eileen J., *Grace and Human Freedom in the Theology of Henri Bouillard* (Bethesda, 2007).
Sesboüé, Bernard, *Karl Rahner* [Initiations aux théologiens] (Paris, 2001).
——, *Yves de Montcheuil, 1900–1944: Précurseur en théologie* [Cogitatio fidei 255] (Paris, 2006.
Shanley, Brian J., *The Thomist Tradition* [Handbook of Contemporary Philosophy of Religion 2] (Boston and London, 2002).
Sölle, Dorothee, *Against the Wind: Memoir of a Radical Christian* (Minneapolis, 1999).
Spinello, Richard A., *The Encyclicals of John Paul II: An Introduction and Commentary* (Lanham, 2012).
Stehle, HansJakob, *Die Ostpolitik des Vatikans, 1917–1975* (Münich and Zürich, 1975).
Storia della Teologia, ed. Rino Fisichella, Vol. 3: *Da Vitus Pichler a Henri de Lubac* (Bologna, 1996).
Strauss, David Friedrich, *Das Leben Jesu* (Tübingen, 1835–6).
Sullivan, Francis A., *Salvation Outside the Church? Tracing the History of the Catholic Response* (New York, 1992).
Talar, Charles J.T., *Rereading, Reception and Rhetoric: Approaches to Roman Catholic Modernism* [American University Studies, Series 7: Theology and Religion 106] (New York, 1999).
Tanner, Norman P., *Vatican II: The Essential Texts* (New York, 2012).
——, *The Church in Council: Conciliar movements, Religious Practice and the Papacy from Nicaea to Vatican II* (London, 2011).
The Belgian Contribution to the Second Vatican Council, ed. Doris Donnelly, Joseph Famerée, Mathijs Lamberigts and Karim Schelkens [BETL 216] (Louvain, 2008).
The Catholic Church in the Twentieth Century: Renewing and Reimagining the City of God, ed. John Deedy (Collegeville, 2000).
The Dawn of Religious Pluralism: Voices From the World's Parliament of Religions, 1893, ed. Richard Hughes and Ronald R. Kidd (LaSalle, 1993).
The Ecumenical Legacy of Cardinal Willebrands, 1909–2006, ed. Adelbert Denaux and Peter De Mey [BETL 253] (Louvain, 2012).
The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology Since 1918, ed. David Ford (Oxford, 2005).
The Papacy and the New World Order: Vatican Diplomacy, Catholic Opinion and International Politics at the Time of Leo XIII, 1878–1903, ed. Vincent Viaene (Louvain, 2005).
The Quintessence of Lives: Intellectual Biographies in the Low Countries presented to Jan Roegiers, ed. Dries Vanysacker et al. [BRHE 91] (Turnhout, 2010).
The Ratzinger Reader: Mapping a Theological Journey, ed. Lieven Boeve and Gerard Mannion (New York, 2010).
The Schillebeeckx Reader, ed. Robert Schreiter (New York, 1984).

The Theology of Dorothee Soelle, ed. Sarah K. Pinnock (Harrisburg, 2003).
The Transformation of the Christian Churches in Western Europe, 1945–2000, ed. Leo Kenis, Jaak Billiet and Patrick Pasture (Louvain, 2010).
The Twentieth Century: A Theological Overview, ed. Gregory Baum (Maryknoll, 1999).
The Vision of John Paul II: Assessing His Thought and Influence, ed. Gerard Mannion (Collegeville MN, 2008).
Theobald, Christoph, *La réception du concile Vatican II*, Vol. 1: *Accéder à la source* [Unam sanctam: N.S. 1] (Paris, 2009).
Theologie—wohin? Auf dem Weg zu einem neuen Paradigma, ed. Hans Küng and David Tracy (Zürich, 1984).
Thils, Gustave, *Orientations de la théologie* [BETL 11] (Louvain, 1958).
——, *Théologie des réalités terrestres*, 2 Vols. (Bruges, 1947–9).
Timoniere in tempi difficili: Paolo VI e la crisi postconciliare, ed. Jörg Ernesti [Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Paolo VI] (Concesio, 2013).
Toda, Michel, *Louis de Bonald, théoricien de la Contre-Révolution* (Étampes, 1997).
Tornielli, Andrea, *Paolo VI: L'audacia di un papa* (Milan, 2009).
——, *Pio XII: Eugenio Pacelli: Un uomo sul trono di Pietro* (Milan, 2007).
Towards the Healing of Schism: The Sees of Rome and Constantinople: Public Statements and Correspondence between the Holy See and the Ecumenical Patriarchate 1958–1984, ed. Edward J. Stormon [Ecumenical Documents 3] (New York, 1987).
Tshibangu, Tarcisus, *La théologie comme science au XX^{ème} siècle* (Kinshasa, 1980).
Turbanti, Giovanni, *Un concilio per il mondo moderno: La redazione della costituzione pastorale Gaudium et spes del Vaticano II* (Bologna, 2000).
Tyrrell, George, *Through Scylla and Charybdis or the Old Theology and the New* (London, 1907).
Une école de théologie: Le Saulchoir, ed. Alberigo Giuseppe et al. [Théologies] (Paris, 1985).
Valente, Massimiliano, *Diplomazia pontificia e Kulturkampf: La Sante Sede e la Prussia tra Pio IX e Bismarck, 1862–1878* [Regione e società 45] (Rome, 2004).
Vatican II au Canada: Enracinement et réception, ed. Gilles Routhier [Héritage et projet 64] (Montréal, 2001).
Vatican II comme style: L'herméneutique théologique du Concile, ed. Joseph Famerée [Unam sanctam: N.S. 4] (Paris, 2012).
Vatican II et la théologie: Perspectives pour le XXI siècle, ed. Philippe Bordeyne and Laurent Villemin [Cogitatio fidei 254] (Paris, 2006).
Vatican II: La sacramentalité de l'église et le Royaume, ed. Étienne Michelin and Antoine Guggenheim [Centre Notre-Dame de Vie: Série théologie 13] (Paris, 2008).
Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition, ed. Matthew L. Lamb and Matthew Levering (Oxford and New York, 2008).
Velati, Mauro, *Dialogo e rinnovamento: Verbali e testi del segretariato per l'unità dei cristiani nella preparazione del Concilio Vaticano II, 1960–1962* [Fonti e strumenti di ricerca 5] (Bologna, 2011).
——, *Una difficile transizione: Il cattolicesimo tra unionismo ed ecumenismo, 1952–1964* [TRSR: N.S. 16] (Bologna, 1996).
Versace, Eliana, *Montini e l'apertura a sinistra: Il falso mito del vescovo progressista* (Milano, 2007).
Verso il concilio Vaticano II, 1960–1962: Passagi e problemi della preparazione conciliare, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Alberto Melloni [TRSR: N.S. 11] (Genova, 1993).
Vilanova, Evangelista, *Histoire des theologies chrétiennes*, 3 Vols. Vol. 1: *Des origines au XV siècle*; Vol. 2: *Préréforme, réformes, contre-réforme*; Vol. 3: *XVIII–XX siècle* [Initiations] (Paris, 1997).
Visser, 't Hooft, Willem Adolf, *Memoirs* (London, 1987).
Voderholzer, Rudolf, *Henri de Lubac begegnen* [Zeugen des Glaubens] (Augsburg, 1999).
von Döllinger, Ignaz, *Christentum und Kirche* (Munich, 1860).
——, *Kirche und Kirchen: Papsttum und Kirchenstaat* (Munich, 1861).

von Drey, Johann Sebastian, *Brief Introduction to the Study of Theology with Reference to the Scientific Standpoint and the Catholic System*, Translated with an Introduction and Annotation by Michael J. Himes [Notre Dame Studies in Theology 1] (Notre Dame and London, 1994).
von Görres, Johann Joseph, *Christliche Mystik* (Munich, 1836–42).
von Ketteler, Wilhelm Emmanuel, *Freiheit, Autorität und Kirche* (Mainz, 1862).
von Kuhn, Johannes, *Das Leben Jesu wissenschaftlich bearbeitet* (Mainz, 1838).
von Teuffenbach, Alexandra, *Papst Johannes XXIII. begegnen* (Augsburg, 2005).
——, *Pio XII tra storia, politica e fede* (Rome, 2008).
Wagner, Jean-Pierre, *Henri de Lubac* [Initiations aux théologiens] (Paris, 2001).
Walter, Peter, *Johann Baptist Franzelin, 1816–1886, Jesuit, Theologe, Kardinal: Ein Lebensbild* (Bozen, 1987).
Warthmann, Stefan, *Die katholische Tübinger Schule: Zur Geschichte Ihrer Wahrnehmung* [Contubernium: Tübinger Beiträge zur Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte 75] (Stuttgart, 2011).
Wassilowsky, Günther, *Universales Heilssakrament Kirche: Karl Rahners Beitrag zur Ekklesiologie des II. Vatikanums* [Innsbrucker theologische Studien 59] (Innsbruck, 2001).
Weigel, George, *The End and the Beginning: Pope John Paul II: The Struggle for Freedom, the Last Years, the Legacy* (New York, 2010).
Weiler, Thomas, *Volk Gottes—Leib Christi: Die Ekklesiologie Joseph Ratzingers und ihr Einfluss auf das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil, Aspekte eines Zusammenhangs* (Mainz, 1997).
White, Ruth L., *L'Avenir de La Mennais: Son rôle dans la presse de son temps* [Bibliothèque française et romane. Série c: Études littéraires 42] (Paris, 1974).
Wicks, Jared, *Doing Theology* (New York, 2009).
Winling, Raymond, *La théologie contemporaine, 1945–1980* (Paris, 1985).
Wojtyla, Karol, *En esprit et en vérité: Receuil de textes, 1949–1978* (Paris, 1980).
Wolf, Hubert, *Clemens August Graf von Galen: Gehorsam und Gewissen* (Freiburg, 2006).
——, *Pope and Devil: The Vatican's Archives and the Third Reich* (Cambridge, 2010).
Yves Congar: Theologian of the Church, ed. Gabriel Flynn [LTPM 32] (Louvain, Paris and Dudley, 2005).
Zizola, Giancarlo, *Giovanni XXIII: La fede e la politica* (Rome, 2000).
——, *L'Utopia di Papa Giovanni* (Assisi, 1973^3).

INDEX OF NAMES